

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON ROADS

Hearings will be continued on H. R. 2426 in the Roads Committee room, 1011 New House Office Building, at 10 a. m. Thursday, March 16, 1944.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the land-grants subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Thursday, March 16, 1944.

Business to be considered: To begin hearings on H. R. 4184 entitled "To amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic."

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

The Committee on Invalid Pensions will hold hearings on Thursday, March 16, 1944, at 10:30 a. m., in the committee room, 247 House Office Building, on S. 1225, entitled "An act granting a pension to Constance Eager," which was introduced by Senator TYDINGS, and S. 662, entitled "An act to authorize pensions for certain physically or mentally helpless children, and for other purposes," which was introduced by Senator BILBO.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on Thursday, March 16, 1944, at 10:30 a. m., to consider H. R. 2328 and House Joint Resolution 49 (to declare certain papers, pamphlets, books, pictures, and writings nonmailable). Hearings will be held.

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will continue its hearings on House Joint Resolution 148 (joint resolution to permit the diversion of waters from Lake Michigan to safeguard the public health) on March 22, 1944, at 10:30 a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1295. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the part of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes," approved June 4, 1920, as amended, relating to the conservations, care, custody, protection, and operation of the naval petroleum and oil-shale reserves; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

1296. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ordnance manufacturing and production facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

1297. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1298. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1944, for the Navy Department and naval service, amounting to \$1,081,000,000 cash and \$1,500,000,000 contract authorization, together with proposed provisions affecting certain naval appropriations for the fiscal

years 1942 and 1944 (H. Doc. No. 498); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

1299. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the budget for the Office of Scientific Research and Development for the fiscal year 1945, amounting to \$121,135,000 (H. Doc. No. 499); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

1300. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the War Production Board of the Office for Emergency Management for the fiscal year 1945, amounting to \$69,894,000 (H. Doc. No. 500); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1301. A letter from the Assistant Secretary-Treasurer, the American Commission for the Protection and Salvage of Artistic and Historic Monuments in Europe, transmitting a copy of the report Quarterly Estimate of Personnel Requirements called for by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget under Circular 421 dated May 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. REED of New York: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 4410. A bill to extend for an additional 90 days the period during which certain grains and other products to be used for livestock and poultry feed may be imported from foreign countries free of duty; without amendment (Rept. No. 1258). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. O'NEAL: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 4414. A bill making appropriations for the legislative branch and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1259). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 4327. A bill to regulate boxing contests and exhibitions in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1261). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 4415. A bill to authorize the admission into the United States and the naturalization of natives, and descendants of natives, of India; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 4416. A bill to amend section 25 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 4417. A bill to provide additional compensation for certain civilian employees of the Governments of the United States and the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 4418. A bill to amend Public Law 816, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 4419. A bill to permit official mail of the American Red Cross to be transmitted free of postage under the penalty privilege;

to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan:

H. J. Res. 254. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1944, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BULWINKLE:

H. Con. Res. 72. Concurrent resolution to provide for appropriate commemoration of the centennial of the telegraph on May 24, 1944; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Puerto Rico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to put the same restriction upon rum being imported into the United States as we did on molasses; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and Congress of the United States to favor the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5267. By Mr. LANE: Resolution adopted by the New England Zionist Emergency Council March 6, 1944, at a dinner at the Hotel Statler, Boston, Mass., urging that the British White Paper of 1939 should be revoked, and that a home for the Jewish people be established in Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

5268. By Mr. WILLEY: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of Delaware favoring House bill 2082, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 16, 1944

(Legislative day of Monday, February 7, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, as morning climbs to noontide we pause in the heat and burden of the toiling day, that prayer for a sense of Thy presence and assurance of Thy guidance may rise like incense from the altar of our hearts. Cleanse us, we beseech Thee, from secret faults which may mar our public service. We cannot be the prophets of world peace if in our own hearts are entrenched the very things which make for war. We cannot call mankind to put aside the weapons of carnage and destruction if our own lives are arsenals of hatred and of prejudice and of a selfish passion to rule. Disarm our own spirits. May Thy kingdom of love and righteousness come within us

that we may contribute worthily to mankind's abiding peace.

As the battle against the massed battalions of darkness sweeps on to its fiery climax and so many of our homes are already desolate at the dread tidings that one dearer than life has gone beyond recall, may the awful price of preserving liberty bought with such a cost subdue our pride, shame our selfishness, and intensify our devotion. Deliver us from the evil of national policies whose fateful consequence will be still another war. May we clearly see and faithfully follow the things that belong to our peace. We ask it in the Name above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, March 14, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on March 14, 1944, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

- S. 391. An act for the relief of Jack Lecel Haas;
- S. 397. An act for the relief of Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Svend J. Skou;
- S. 1427. An act to authorize the appointment of Gregory Boyington, a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps;
- S. 1563. An act for the relief of W. E. Dowdell and June Dowdell; and
- S. 1668. An act authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ship repair facilities, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1285) to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

- H. R. 4377. An act authorizing the President to present, in the name of Congress, a Distinguished Service Medal to Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, United States Navy; and
- H. R. 4410. An act to extend for an additional 90 days the period during which certain grains and other products to be used for livestock and poultry feed may be imported from foreign countries free of duty.

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

- S. 1589. An act for the relief of C. Guy Evans, Garland Mineral Springs, Ind., Wash.;

H. R. 929. An act for the relief of Irving L. Jones;

H. R. 1062. An act for the relief of the estate of John H. Cathcart;

H. R. 1201. An act to permit prosecutions after the lapse of a temporary statute for offenses committed prior to its expiration;

H. R. 1273. An act for the relief of the heirs of Simon M. Myhre;

H. R. 1469. An act for the relief of Robert Beckwith, Julius Buettner, and Emma M. Buettner;

H. R. 1488. An act to provide a right-of-way for an oil pipe line over the Ogden Ordnance Depot Military Reservation;

H. R. 1518. An act for the relief of Mrs. Bessie Pike and Mrs. Estelle Rosenfeld;

H. R. 1847. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Richard Zielinski, a minor;

H. R. 2091. An act for the relief of Mrs. Gladys M. Greenleaf and the estate of Ralph Alton Greenleaf, deceased;

H. R. 2183. An act for the relief of Mathilde B. Meister;

H. R. 2189. An act for the relief of Kenneth E. Shepard;

H. R. 2385. An act for the relief of Nadine Gorman;

H. R. 2419. An act to change the name of "laborer" in the Postal Service to that of "mail handler";

H. R. 2440. An act for the relief of Mrs. Priscilla B. McCarthy;

H. R. 2459. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Carl Oplinger, City Hospital of Akron, Ohio, and to Dr. Walter A. Hoyt;

H. R. 2772. An act for the relief of Edwin Foley;

H. R. 2875. An act for the relief of Adelard Demers;

H. R. 2880. An act for the relief of H. G. Tooley;

H. R. 2956. An act for the protection of the water supply of the city of Sitka, Alaska;

H. R. 2993. An act for the relief of John W. Booth III;

H. R. 2999. An act for the relief of Leo Gullo;

H. R. 3199. An act for the relief of Henry Grossi;

H. R. 3173. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Lorraine Novak, a minor;

H. R. 3195. An act for the relief of Willard Kerr, Jr.;

H. R. 3371. An act for the relief of the dependents of Dr. Arthur B. Wyse, and others;

H. R. 3387. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Jason McVay Austin;

H. R. 3547. An act for the relief of Carl F. E. Wilson;

H. R. 3618. An act to authorize the War Food Administrator to sell and convey to Mrs. Andrew J. Frey, and her heirs, a certain tract of land, situated in the county of San Joaquin, State of California, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3701. An act for the relief of Clinton A. Clauson; and

H. R. 3763. An act to relieve former postal employees who performed postal duties after induction into the military service.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Buck	Downey
Andrews	Burton	Eastland
Austin	Bushfield	Ellender
Bailey	Byrd	Ferguson
Bankhead	Capper	George
Barkley	Clark, Idaho	Gillette
Bilbo	Clark, Mo.	Gurney
Bone	Connally	Hatch
Brewster	Cordon	Hawkes
Bridges	Danaher	Hayden
Brooks	Davis	Hill

Holman
Jackson
Johnson, Colo.
Kilgore
La Follette
Langer
McCarran
McClellan
McFarland
McKellar
Maloney
Mead
Millikin
Murray

O'Mahoney
Overton
Fepper
Radcliffe
Revercomb
Reynolds
Robertson
Russell
Shipstead
Stewart
Taft
Thomas, Idaho
Thomas, Okla.
Thomas, Utah

Tobey
Tunnell
Tydings
Vandenberg
Wagner
Walsh, N. J.
Weeks
Wheeler
Wherry
White
Willis
Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness; the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] are detained on public business. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are necessarily absent.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

MEMORIAL ADDRESSES ON THE LATE SENATOR CHARLES L. McNARY, OF OREGON

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I submit a resolution, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 269) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the legislative business of the Senate be now suspended to enable tributes to be paid to the life, character, and public service of Hon. CHARLES L. McNARY, late a Senator from the State of Oregon.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the United States Senate not only does credit to its own sensibilities, but it also does justice to authentic history, when it temporarily suspends its regular proceedings this afternoon to make the RECORD speak in final tribute to the memory of a deeply cherished comrade and a stalwart, sterling public servant who has been gathered to his fathers.

The sudden and untimely death of Senator CHARLES L. McNARY, of Oregon, at the very moment when we all were encouraged by reports of his confident and early convalescence, bespeaks a loss which defies the successful use of words to measure. It is the loss to the Republic of a great and effective statesman. It is the loss to Congress of a great and

skillful legislator. It is the loss to his associates of a great and precious friend.

Senator McNARY came to his high responsibilities in the midst of the first World War. He leaves them in the throes of the second and what we pray may be the last. In this epochal, intervening quarter century, when History has been writing with a rushing pen, he was one of the wisest, soundest, and ablest public men of his generation. In his quiet, modest, and totally unassuming way, he exerted major influence—and always constructive influence—on the legislative history of his times. Indelibly he leaves his vivid mark upon the story and the statutes of his mourning country.

Through a perilous and perplexing decade, he ably guided the Republican Party as its greatly loved and highly competent leader upon this Senate floor. He was the master of all parliamentary techniques. Behind his unfailing kindness and courtesy were strength, astuteness, and an iron will. He led by persuasion rather than by force. Common sense was ever his prime counselor, as the Constitution and the law were his unfailing lamps. His Party's faith was reflected when it enthusiastically named him for the Vice Presidency of the United States. His integrity, his vision, his talents and his honor were worthy of this or any other accolade.

But he was never just a partisan. In the finest sense of the sacred word, he was a great American. Whether as a jurist in his earlier career, or as a legislator in the climax of his devotion to his country, he was true to the finest instincts of a deeply conscientious public servant, and to the best traditions of the Constitutional Republic which he loved so much and served so long and so well.

Amid all his honors, he remained as friendly and considerate a soul as ever gave gentle companionship to his fellow men. He was never touched by the pomp of power. He was never lured from the realities of human fellowship. His popularity with his colleagues was matched only by their granite confidence in him. I shall not soon forget the unique and moving demonstrations of this poignant fact enacted on the funeral train as it sped across the western plains on its way to his last, long home. Twenty of us—colleagues all—gathered in one car; and each of us—one by one—rose spontaneously to speak simply, frankly, and from the heart, about our associate and friend. It was a rare and unusual tribute, without a precedent within my time.

It was as recently as last November that the late distinguished Senator from Oregon stood at his accustomed corner seat on yonder aisle, in the full vigor of his splendid faculties, so far as any of us knew, and in complete command of his great responsibilities. Little did any man among us remotely sense that we were looking upon our living friend for the last time as he strode vigorously from the Senate forum that final afternoon, never to return. But he never for an instant left our hearts nor was deserted by our anxieties. "What's the news from Charley?" was the constant, intimate,

daily question upon all our lips, eloquently testifying to the bond that bound him to his fellow men. Life affords few greater triumphs.

He was devoted to the soil. It was the key to his wholesome character. All things of agriculture were his deep attachment. He was happiest when close to nature and when lingering upon the fertile acres of his beloved country home. Always his heart was turning westward to the Oregon Trail. His was the spirit of those rugged pioneers from whence he sprang. He was a builder of the new West as they were of the old. We followed him, and his mourning family, in stricken grief—but with gladness that we could have known him and his genius and his kindly ways—as he took to the Oregon Trail for the last time.

The Republican Party has lost a faithful and effective leader. America has lost a powerful and devoted Senator. I humbly add that I have lost a cherished friend who has been my closest legislative associate for 16 years. Hail. And farewell.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, "An honest man's the noblest work of God."

My former colleague, Senator CHARLES L. McNARY, of Oregon, has been called to the house of his fathers. On Friday, February 25, at Fort Lauderdale, in Florida, where it was believed he was recuperating satisfactorily from a then recent operation, he suddenly departed this life. We mourn his passing, revere his memory, and honor his good name.

CHARLES L. McNARY was possibly the most universally loved Member of this honorable body. On all sides and in every quarter only words of affectionate regard for him, and expressions in praise of his public work and private life, are heard. His kind disposition, unerring tact, consummate wisdom, and patriotic zeal for the best interests of his State and Nation, and his deep devotion to the welfare of the American people, were inherent in him, and were recognized by all who knew and understood him.

CHARLES L. McNARY, the last of 10 children, was born in 1874 at the farm home of his maternal grandparents, Charles and Mary Claggett, in the beautiful and fertile Willamette Valley, near Salem, the capital of Oregon. In this pleasant environment he spent his childhood and youth.

Unhappily, at the early age of 4 years, he lost his mother, and a year later his father also. A kind and loving elder sister assumed the care of this orphaned boy, directed his early conduct, and guided him in the formation of his habits and character. "As the twig is bent, the tree's inclined." His later successes and achievements are a monument to her intelligent, faithful, and affectionate care of her little brother Charles.

As a boy, and as a youth, CHARLES L. McNARY had his chores to do and he did them, reliably and well. By dint of his own persevering efforts under great difficulties, which were indicative of his self-reliance throughout his entire life, he went to college and studied law. The time came when he sat upon the Supreme Court of Oregon as a justice of that court.

The McNarys and the Claggetts were of good—the best—American stock, and this native son of Oregon had within him by inheritance and by breeding the finest qualities of his race and Nation. For generations his people had been pioneers, frontiersmen, and farmers. They had come to America in colonial days, had fought in the American Revolution against British oppression, and later they had followed Daniel Boone and the earliest settlers into the Ohio Valley. The States of Kentucky, Tennessee, Indiana, and Illinois knew them prior to his immediate forebears joining the covered-wagon trains of the early emigrants to Oregon.

Just 100 years ago his grandfather, James McNary, determined to cross the plains with his family to Oregon, and began making his plans accordingly. Early in the year 1845, the McNarys were on the long, long Oregon Trail. The first wagons had arrived in the Willamette Valley in 1843 but 2 years previously.

Only after 6 long months on the overland route did the creaking, worn, oxen-drawn covered wagons and the tired and weary emigrants at last descend the rugged western mountain slopes to the beautiful Oregon country. Often, only by following the courses of the mighty rivers of that western country, and at times actually using the beds of the smaller streams for their only roadways, did the Oregon pioneers, foremost among whom were the McNarys, finally come to rest in the finest and fairest of fertile valleys—the promised land of the western pioneers—the valley of the beautiful Willamette.

Only the survivors of the fittest of all those American emigrants who started across the plains in the 1840's and 1850's finally got through to Oregon. The faint of heart turned back and the weak of body perished on the way. Only the resolute of spirit and those of dauntless courage, fortified by the muscle and sinews of centuries-old breeding, persevered to found an empire in the wilderness beside the western sea. The Oregon pioneers may, at times, have been destitute, and were; but they never were poor.

From such stock our beloved colleague sprung. He had the ways of his forebears. He was of them. His perseverance through difficulties and his helpfulness to others less fortunate than himself were his characteristic traits. He knew and practiced the industry, thrift, and economy of the empire builders. He did not stand by the side of the road wagging his thumb. He always could walk, and walk on his own feet, and he could walk alone.

CHARLES L. McNARY was the son of the Oregon pioneers. For his homely ways, his direct and efficient resolution of complicated problems and situations into their simple elements, and for his honesty and cooperation, he was loved and respected by all those who knew him best. He was a great American, a leader in the Senate of the United States, an honest man, a real friend, and Oregon's favorite son.

May God bless and keep him. His life exemplifies the biblical admonition that

"A good name is rather to be chosen than great riches, and loving favor than silver and gold."

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, we commemorate today the life and death of one of America's greatest public servants.

Senator McNARY served in the Senate of the United States from May 29, 1917, to November 5, 1918, and from December 18, 1918, to the time of his death. In 1933, he was chosen minority leader of his party in this body. In 1940, he was the nominee of his party for the office of Vice President of the United States. This period of political activity and legislative service included the epic years of the First World War, the post-war period, the years of economic depression which followed, and the trying days which preceded our entry into the present war, and many months of our participation therein. There has been in the life of our Nation no like span of time in which a public man has been confronted by such complex problems and has made such soul-trying decisions. Senator McNARY shared in full measure the responsibilities of these years and their momentous events.

Before entering public life, Senator McNARY had been a practicing lawyer; an educator in the law; and a justice of the Supreme Court of Oregon.

In these two principal fields of endeavor our late colleague served with rare distinction. In them he brought honor to himself and made great contribution to the welfare of his State and the Nation.

Senator McNARY was a profound student of all political and governmental questions, but of particular interest to him were the difficult problems of agriculture, of hydroelectric development and associated irrigation and reclamation projects. His efforts in their behalf were impressive aids to all that has been accompanied in these fields.

Procedure in the Senate is governed by precedents and by written rule. Senator McNARY was the master of both. His familiarity with parliamentary principles and with the correct application of them, with Senate practice and its sustaining precedents, was both comprehensive and detailed. He was one of the great parliamentarians of this generation. This knowledge and skill were used, not obstructively, but always in furtherance of legislative progress.

He was never an extremist in his views or in his legislative efforts. He sought to embody in law the principles which responded most completely to the common judgment of the American people and which he believed would therefore best serve them. He was a clear and logical thinker, firm in his adherence to the conclusions to which his reasoning mind led him. However strongly held and however positively expressed were his views, his kindness and graciousness made impossible any suggestion of intolerance on his part. He was a wise counselor and patient leader. In his relations with his fellow Members and men elsewhere he was tolerant, courteous, and kindly.

No Member exerted greater influence in the Senate than he. No Member held in greater degree the affection of his

associates. No Member commanded greater respect. His death brings to unnumbered friends and to his colleagues here a sense of tragic loss. His party suffers grievously in the termination of his thoughtful and steady leadership. The country will miss in this high place his keen sense of public duty and his ideals of public service.

An able, kindly, courteous, courageous, Christian gentleman has gone from among us, but we are comforted with the knowledge that he has found deserved rest, peace, and joy everlasting.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it is said that as men grow in years they look with equanimity upon the approach of death. I do not know whether that is true. I might well express the hope that it is; but I have not yet reached the status in my own life where I look with equanimity upon it, insofar as I am concerned or insofar as my friends are concerned. That is peculiarly true as I rise to pay in a few words a feeble but an abundantly deserved tribute to Senator McNARY.

It is strange how fate sometimes plays tricks upon the lives of men. In conversation one day with Senator McNARY, talking about our ancestry and about the romantic history of migrations among American people in the settlement of our country, it developed that his grandfather and my grandfather were born and reared within 5 miles of each other, in the State of North Carolina. My people went from there into Tennessee, and up into Kentucky. His went across Tennessee, tarried for a while in Kentucky, and found their way on to the Pacific coast in the State of Oregon. Then, as if two sunken streams reappeared on the surface of the earth, he and I appeared here in opposition stations across this aisle in the Senate of the United States. That is strange; but no more strange than the fate of many others, by the millions, who no doubt could recount similar ancestral experiences.

That circumstance, of course, drew us closer together than would be true otherwise, because of the parallel of our families. We were drawn together by reason of our position here in the Senate; and our relationship was more intimate, more confidential, and, I might say, more co-operative than was ever known by the Members of this body as a whole. In the very nature of things, two men occupying the stations he and I during the past 7 years occupied across the aisle must necessarily confer with each other daily, and sometimes more frequently. Not only is it necessary that that should be done, in order that we might as much as possible smooth the pathway of legislation, but it is in the interest of the country, I believe; and I am sure that he felt the same way, that those who take any leading part in guiding the legislative process here should very frequently indulge in confidential conversations and relations and plans in order that each might be helpful to the other, and that both might be helpful to the Senate and to the country. Senator McNARY not only was courteous; he would have been that unavoidably, for he came of a race of cultured, refined, broad-minded, magnani-

mous people whose roots sprang out of the very pioneer days of our country. All his personal inclinations were in that direction. But in a broader and deeper sense his responsibility to the Senate, to his political party, and to his country, and even in a broader sense his responsibility to mankind, in the position which he held, impelled him to that high-minded attitude toward his duties and toward our duties here.

There are many things I might say about him in tribute to his legislative genius; his knowledge of the procedures, not only from study but from experience; his interest in agriculture, from which his ancestors, as mine, sprang, and in which they engaged practically all their lives. While he was a specialist on agricultural problems, his mind was broad enough and deep enough to encompass all the problems which face us as a Nation industrially, economically, politically, and socially. He was frequently of very great value and assistance to me, not only in advice and counsel which I sought freely, but in smoothing the pathway of legislation, not only that of a nonpartisan character, but legislation in which partisan difference might be supposed to exist legitimately. I am under a deep and abiding obligation to Senator McNARY for the great, valuable, sometimes indispensable assistance I received from him, and also for the high example of nonpartisan consideration, without regard to party differences, of the problems which face us as a whole. I mourn his loss. I shall always cherish his memory. I shall always acknowledge freely the profound obligation which I am under to him, and which the country as a whole is under to him, for the magnificent services he rendered as a United States Senator and as an American citizen.

I do not know how to express my feeling in the sense that I have experienced this deep, personal loss. For his State, for his family, for his country, I join in the expression of deep sympathy and appreciation for his life and for his example. I felt so strongly about it that it was my desire to attend the funeral, in order that I might pay a last tribute to him; but circumstances over which I had no control forbade that.

Peace to his ashes, to his memory. May those of us who are to remain for a season, but who in time will join him in that innumerable caravan, take with us through the remainder of our lives and into our graves the happy and reassuring knowledge that here was a man in every sense of the word.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I came to the Senate on March 4, 1917. Senator McNARY came to the Senate by appointment of the Governor of Oregon in May 1918, and served a short term. He was again appointed and served another term; and in 1919 he came to the Senate by the vote of the people of Oregon and remained here until his death.

Shortly after he came to the Senate, one day he asked me if we did not have some McNARYs in Tennessee. I told him that we had. We had a very distinguished family of McNARYs in Tennessee in our early history. One of them had

been one of the most distinguished judges in our State, and a county had been named for him. Senator McNARY traced his relationship to that distinguished citizen of Tennessee. In that way we became friends almost from the beginning.

Senator McNARY had several outstanding characteristics. One of the most important of them was his unswerving honesty and integrity. CHARLEY McNARY was as honest a man as I ever knew in my life. No one ever questioned or could ever question his integrity.

Another of his outstanding qualities was his ability as a legislator. He was quiet, reserved, unobtrusive, and apparently unambitious; and yet few Members of this body kept up with legislation as well as did CHARLEY McNARY, and none any better.

To my mind the most outstanding of all his splendid qualities was his gentlemanliness. He was one of the most courteous, delightful, good-humored, and all-the-time agreeable gentlemen I ever knew. I never knew him to do an ungentlemanly thing; and so far as I now recall, I never heard him say an ungentlemanly thing. I think he was one of the most perfect gentlemen I ever knew.

He had a wonderful career in the Senate. He served for nearly 27 years. He took a leading part almost from the beginning. He did more for his State than perhaps any other man who ever represented it in Congress. In helping to establish the Bonneville Dam and other dams, not only in his State, but in adjoining States, he did a magnificent piece of work.

Like the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], I shall feel eternally grateful to Senator McNARY for his cordial and warm support, not in talk, but in kindly, generous action. He helped me build the dams on the Tennessee River. CHARLEY McNARY did a thousandfold more than many of those who had much more to say about the building of those dams. I shall ever be grateful to him.

In the strictest sense, Senator McNARY was not a partisan. He was a good Republican; he believed in the principles and doctrines of his party always; but he was fair and kindly disposed toward those of us on this side of the aisle, and worked with us for the benefit of the country whenever the interest and progress of the country were at stake. He was a progressive Senator. He believed in building up, and not tearing down. He believed in doing things in his kindly and quiet way.

Incidentally, let me say to Senators on the other side of the aisle that he was a very fine leader of the Republican Party. That was proved by the great confidence Republicans showed in him when he was chosen as their candidate for Vice President in the last campaign. He was worthy of such a mark of distinction or any other mark of distinction.

CHARLEY McNARY was one of the best men who ever sat in this body since I have been a Member of it—and I have been here a long time. When it came to a show-down, perhaps no man on either side of the aisle had more real influence than had CHARLEY McNARY.

In his quiet, gentle, generous, well-disposed, and kindly way, he did more for his State and for his country than most of us realize until we look at the record. He was as fine an American citizen as ever lived. When I think of such a man as he dying suddenly, I realize what a terrible thing it is, especially for those who are left behind. Again I say that this body never knew a finer gentleman, a better legislator, or a better American than CHARLES L. McNARY. He and I were warm personal friends from the beginning. I revere and esteem his memory. I rejoice in the good works which were his, and am proud that I knew such a grand man, for he was a man, every inch of him.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, by designation I am directed to report that yesterday the Republican minority conference, by unanimous action, adopted the following resolution:

Whereas Almighty God in His infinite wisdom has taken from us our beloved colleague the Honorable CHARLES LINZA McNARY, late senior Senator from the State of Oregon; and

Whereas throughout his more than 27 years in the United States Senate he rendered to our Nation and to his State a most distinguished service, which will ever grace his name in the annals of history; and

Whereas he was our affectionate friend and trusted counselor, ever ready to give of himself, of his efforts, and of his judgment for our guidance, and hence became our leader and the spokesman for the Republican Party in the United States Senate during a most critical period: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the Republican colleagues in the United States Senate of the Honorable CHARLES LINZA McNARY, express our sense of loss at his passing and join in asking that this evidence of our regard for him and for his memory may be caused to be printed in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; and

Further, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to Mrs. Cornelia M. McNary, at Salem, Ore., that she may be assured of our deep respect for her and of our condolences to her upon the passing of our friend, her husband.

In witness whereof we have hereunto set our hands at Washington, in the District of Columbia, this 15th day of March 1944:

A. H. VANDENBERG, WALLACE H. WHITE, JR., WARREN R. AUSTIN, CHAPMAN REVERCOMB, ROBERT A. TAFT, JOHN A. DANAHER, C. WAYLAND BROOKS, STYLES BRIDGES, JOHN THOMAS, CHAS. W. TOBEY, OWEN BREWSTER, RAYMOND E. WILLIS, E. V. ROBERTSON, A. W. HAWKES, WILLIAM LANGER, C. D. BUCK, HOMER FERGUSON, GEORGE D. AIKEN, GUY CORDON, RUFUS C. HOLMAN, HAROLD H. BURTON, E. D. MILLIKIN, HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD, SINCLAIR WEEKS, JAMES J. DAVIS, ARTHUR CAPPER, HENRIK SHIPSTEAD, CHAN GURNEY, KENNETH S. WHERRY, GEO. A. WILSON.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I shall not undertake to cover the public services of Senator McNARY except by general reference. The record of his services is already engraved on the public annals of the Republic. I wish to say a word of a personal nature with reference to Senator McNARY. It is among the sweetest memories of my life that I was privileged to enjoy a rather intimate relationship with him. What the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] has

said about his gentleness and the high standards of his intercourse with other Members of the Senate is eminently true. Senator McNARY appealed to me as a man of a very high conception of ethics and of professional and official conduct. He was a modest man. He carried modesty to the point of a weakness. Instead of flamboyantly pushing himself into the public limelight he was shrinking. He was entirely modest in every respect.

Mr. President, I entertained for him a very deep personal affection and a very high admiration. Today I wanted more than anything else simply to lay upon his tomb, figuratively speaking, a flower in recognition of the great love which I bore him.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, the sands of a great and distinguished life have run out in the hourglass of time. CHARLES L. McNARY has been summoned home. Eternal peace has come at last to one who labored always to bring tranquillity into a troubled world.

CHARLES McNARY devoted his full and gentle life to the service of mankind, and the implicit worthiness of his character must inevitably come to be recognized in the reckonings of time.

History will record for all generations to come that this good and faithful servant was a great legislator, an incisive leader, and a skilled parliamentarian. But CHARLES McNARY was much more than these, Mr. President. CHARLES McNARY was a man who was loved and respected by all who knew him.

There is something about a truly great leader, Mr. President, which counsels and calms, which strengthens and sustains, and so it was with "CHARLEY MAC." His keen mind, his kind word, and his understanding heart brought a mellow gentleness into these halls which they have rarely known in all their long history.

It was inevitable that the mantle of leadership should fall upon his shoulders, for his abiding patience, his clear counsel, and his unflinching devotion to justice gave to him a quality of rare balance which is seldom found in equal degree in any man.

The years which he devoted to his labors here were among the most eventful and historic years this Nation has ever known. Sharp and crucial issues were raised and settled upon the floor of this Chamber during those years—issues which oftentimes burned deeply into the very heart of this cherished man.

Yet never, in all those storms of strife and disagreement, did CHARLES McNARY rage at the opposition; never did he attempt to browbeat or coerce any member of his own party; never did he refuse advice, and never did he falter in his solemn trust.

We who are brought together here learn in time to know and evaluate our colleagues, and I can name no man who really came to know CHARLES McNARY who was not proud to number him among his friends.

As minority leader, CHARLES McNARY knew well the strength and weakness of those who labored with him. But no matter how bitter the issue may have been, McNARY never made light of the

shortcomings of others. He was the companion and compatriot of all, the overseer and tormentor of none.

Life wears best, Mr. President, when it is smoothed by a friendly spirit. And how gently, how fully, flowed the life of this man. The fires of good will which he kindled in the hearts of men will linger always as an inspiring and ennobling light.

We come here today in deep solemnity, for the passing of this man lies heavily on our hearts. His life was, as near as any mortal life could be, a reflection of the eternal truth.

It is as Chaplain Harris said in the Senate a few days ago, "He was a man who could differ without anger, who could debate without bitterness, who could be defeated without rancor, who could win without exultation."

And now, after many full and faithful years of public service, our beloved colleague, who brought to these Halls the wisdom and the strength of pure humanity, has been laid to rest in the homestead of his heart, the rustic, rugged lands of Oregon, whose people paid him immortal tribute by five times selecting him to come to these Halls and labor in their name.

The name and the achievements of CHARLES L. McNARY shall be forever graven on the heart of Oregon and in the annals of time. But the essential goodness, the innate gentleness of his character, will cause men to speak his name with reverence so long as the honor and the history of America endure.

Mr. President, yesterday I sat in the conference of the minority party where the temporary officers recommended, and the full membership concurred, that no permanent officers be selected by the minority until the end of the present year.

This gesture of respect and honor will live in time as a clear and enduring tribute to the name of CHARLES L. McNARY, for it is such a citation of merit as could come only to one whose courage, character, and conduct had brought a profound respect to his Nation and his name.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, words are inadequate to express my deep sense of personal loss when CHARLEY McNARY passed on.

He had been my friend and close associate in the Senate for a quarter of a century. For the past 7 years he had been my seatmate in the Senate. We had talked together, argued together, voted together most of the time, worked together, and played together for the better part of 25 years. I recall that I played my last game of golf with him, I think it was the day before he went to the hospital. And he played a square game of golf just as he played the game of life. Looking back over these years in the Senate, I can recall the Saturday afternoon golf foursome of the 1920's and early 1930's—Charley McNary; Pat Harris, of Mississippi; Jim Couzens, of Michigan; and myself. Charley and Pat and Jim have passed on—good friends all. I have had the privilege and the pleasure of knowing and working and playing with many well-beloved friends

in my lifetime. I think that of all those I have known and loved during my time in the Senate of the United States, there was none who held a warmer place in my affections than CHARLES L. McNARY. I do not expect to see his like again.

Neither can I put into words my appreciation of the loss to my country in the passing of one of the ablest, one of the broadest-minded, and one of the statesmen with the greatest vision, of his day and generation.

I lost a beloved friend, the Nation lost a valued leader, when our colleague was called from his labors here to what I feel is his reward in the unknown world that lies beyond.

CHARLEY McNARY had already made a place for himself in the Senate when I was sworn in, only a few days short of a quarter of a century ago. In the years that followed, we served together on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, Senator McNARY as chairman of that committee, and later as ranking minority member.

During nearly all that quarter of a century we were closely associated as colleagues, as members of the so-called farm bloc, and as intimate friends. I have never known him to hold an unworthy thought, say an unkind word, nor lend his support or cast his vote for a measure which he did not believe was for the best interest of his State and his country.

I have never known a more devoted champion of the farmer in the Congress. But he never proposed special favors for agriculture at the expense of the national welfare. He was not a factional leader; he was a statesman who had a proper measure of the place the farmer holds, and must maintain, in a balanced economy that is necessary if the dream the forefathers had of a representative democracy, a real republican form of government, is to become and remain a reality.

CHARLES L. McNARY was a Republican in politics. But he was not a hide-bound partisan. His republicanism was a national republicanism, not merely a loyalty to a party name. When an immediate partisan advantage in politics, in or out of the Senate, clashed with the national welfare, it seemed to me he submerged his republicanism in the interest of the Nation. This was true of CHARLEY McNARY as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, as a member of the Committee on Agriculture, as a member of the Senate, and as Republican floor leader of the Senate.

I think CHARLES L. McNARY was a liberal in the true sense of the term. He believed in the cooperation of individuals and of political parties to promote the general welfare. But his liberalism did not cause him to denounce and impugn the motives of those who disagreed with him; neither was it the loose-thinking, so-called liberalism, that precludes one from reaching a decision and bringing others to agree on it. And always he was a gentleman in the true sense of that word.

The honors that were bestowed upon him were not gifts from his colleagues nor from the party leaders who nomi-

nated him for the Vice Presidency in 1940. They were earned, and to his party and his people and the Nation he gave a leadership that was wise, beneficent, and, I believe, effective.

He served his people and his State and his Nation well and ably. The number of his friends was limited only by the number of us who knew him personally and were acquainted with his works. We shall not soon see his like again.

I join today with the other Members of the Senate in mourning the passing of an esteemed and beloved friend, an able and distinguished colleague, and a national leader in the truest sense of the term. May his reward in the beyond be commensurate with his labors and his kindnesses in this world.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I have not prepared a suitable address, but I am not content to permit this occasion to pass without some manifestation of my very high esteem for the great and good man whose memory we are commemorating at this time. I was unusually fond of CHARLEY McNARY, and I have good reasons to believe he liked me. Mutual esteem, of course, is essential to true friendship.

When I entered the Senate in 1931 I was assigned to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Senator McNARY at that time was chairman of that committee. From that time until his death we served together on that committee. He made a wonderful chairman of the committee. He was at all times fair and just and enjoyed the confidence and respect of each member of the committee regardless of political affiliations.

We never had much political party alignment in that committee; we do not have it now, and I sincerely believe that much of that spirit of helpful cooperation which has characterized the committee is due to the philosophy and to the actions of CHARLEY McNARY. He held the committee together, and his influence with the members of the committee was as great after he yielded the chairmanship to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] as it was before.

We all know that Senator McNARY's heart was with the farmers of this country. He realized that they had not had justice in our economic structure. He did not render merely lip service; he did not come to the floor of the Senate and proclaim from time to time that he was a friend of the farmer, but he worked for their welfare. He was a constructive statesman who devoted much of his efforts and talents and energy to the cause and to the betterment of rural life.

My friend the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] has pointed out, probably better than I can do, much of the personal characteristics of CHARLEY McNARY. Anyone who knew him intimately over a period of years, as many of us did know him, could not fail to be impressed with the fact that Senator McNARY at all times was a gentleman, truly a gentleman, courteous, kindly, and gentle in his relations with everyone.

This center aisle divides physically the Members of the Senate according to political party affiliations. Senator McNARY, of course, took his place upon

the side occupied by his political party. Time gradually developed his proper place in the Senate, and after the test of a long period of years, many of them through the most trying periods of our history, finally, as a result of his colleagues' acquaintanceship and friendship and knowledge of the man, he was promoted to the highest place of confidence and power at the disposal of his political party, notwithstanding the fact, as has been pointed out, that he was never an objectionable political partisan.

He loved his country. He loved to render service to his fellow man, and he never stopped to consider whether one was a Democrat or a Republican in his personal relations, not only with his acquaintances, but with his fellow men in general.

Senator McNARY has been well characterized here, and I shall not detain the Senate long. He was a familiar figure in the Senate. He was regular in his attendance. He had strict ideas about the performance of his duties and his responsibilities both as a Senator and as a party leader.

Senator McNARY and I for a number of years had arranged to be paired when either of us found it necessary to be absent from the Senate in the performance of his duties. We rarely renewed that pair, because we had an understanding that we would take care of each other when either was absent. I had his confidence that I would do that, and I did it, and he had mine that he would protect me. That is the sort of relation that prevailed between CHARLIE McNARY and a number of southern Senators.

Not long before he left Washington, in talking about our pair relations, he said, "I am not sure we have an effective pair, because we vote the same way about 90 percent of the time." That shows the broad-mindedness of the man. Many of the questions coming before the Senate for vote have properly no political complexion, and the parties as such should not be divided on them.

Senator McNARY, because of his kindly attributes, because of the big, broad-minded qualities of the man, because of his generous, sympathetic heart, will be missed by the Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle as will very few men who have served as Senators. I know that I shall miss him, and I regret his passing almost as much as though he had been a blood relative of mine.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I would not be true to my appreciation of one of the finest and sweetest associations of my life did I not add my humble tribute to the beautiful sentiments expressed here today on the life and services of our lamented colleague, Senator CHARLES L. McNARY.

Though one of the truly great leaders of his day and generation, Senator McNARY was withal a modest gentleman of the old school. Not one act of his during 27 years of service in the Senate of the United States was ever designed to catch a newspaper headline or to attract public attention to himself. When basic principles were involved he

was utterly indifferent to public applause. In my 23 years of political life I have met thousands of public men. I have never known a man who had a higher conception of the true ethics of public service than CHARLES McNARY. There is much to extol in his public record and private life, but I do not think that under any circumstances he would care for fulsome praise.

For years he was the leader of his party in this body. He was a loyal party man, but he had only contempt for that kind of partisanship, on either side of the aisle, which blinds men to their higher obligation to the public interest.

He was a hard and tenacious fighter, but whether he won or lost he felt no bitterness or rancor toward those who differed with him. His was a kindly heart and he loved his friends.

If my colleagues will pardon a personal allusion, I became a Member of the Senate a couple of months before the change in administration in 1933. For some years Senator McNARY had handled the agricultural appropriation bill. When the political tide turned and the Democratic Party came to power, it fell my lot to take over this duty. I was a new Senator, without experience in handling such complicated measures as appropriation bills. Though he was a member of a different political party, I went to Senator McNARY before opening hearings on the bill to seek the benefit of his advice and counsel. He could not have been kinder or more cooperative had I been not only a member of his party but an intimate friend or relative.

For 10 years I leaned heavily upon him, and he gave freely of his great ability and rich experience in solving the many unusual and complex problems which have been before the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations during the past decade. I shall miss him in my work here in the Senate as much as any other Member of this body, or more.

Senator McNARY was a lawyer. He was at one time dean of a law school. He had served as a justice of the supreme court of his native State. Nothing better exemplifies the great heart of this man than that he should interest himself primarily in assisting the farmers of this Nation in their unequal struggle for economic equality. He was interested in the welfare of the farmer without regard to section or party affiliation. In his passing the farmers of this Nation have lost one of their best and most powerful friends. He will be as sorely missed and as sincerely mourned in the farm homes of Georgia and the South as he will be among those who till the soil of his own beautiful Willamette Valley in the great Northwest.

Mr. President, I cannot express any hope for the future more calculated to promote the welfare and progress of the people of the United States and the preservation of our cherished institutions than that providence may vouchsafe that more men possessed of the ideals and vision of CHARLES L. McNARY may find their way to service in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, during my nearly 12 years of service in the United States Senate it was my pleasure and privilege intimately to know the late Senator McNARY, who so ably represented the great State of Oregon in this Chamber. During all these years his office adjoined mine in the Senate Office Building, and not only were we office neighbors but the very nature of the problems of the Northwest country we represented made it both necessary and desirable that we should frequently confer, because the interests of our two States were similar in many fields of human activity.

My long and close association with Senator McNARY made me realize his worth as a statesman and an effective public servant. He was a genial and kindly man, and he never permitted the unending pressure of work confronting him to make him impatient with those who sought his counsel and advice. He was possessed of an unusually fine mind and an unerring sense of values.

During all the years he served as the leader of his party in the United States Senate I have never heard a word of criticism of his capacity for leadership, but, on the contrary, he was universally regarded as not only exceedingly capable, but also as one who guided his party brethren with unerring skill and with great diplomacy. To this may also be added the just tribute that in his leadership he brought to his task the highest sense of personal honor. In his death the State of Oregon lost a stalwart friend and a brilliant and intelligent spokesman, and the United States Senate one of its most beloved Members. I know that every Member of the Senate will join me in saying that his passing brought sincere sorrow to all of us and a great loss to the Nation which he served so many years.

My own life was enriched because I had known him as a friend, and as I utter these words I am deeply conscious of the personal loss I have sustained. The words that any of us utter here today are but a feeble tribute to a great man who possessed a fine and gentle soul.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I wish to say a brief word of farewell to a friend and great leader whose character is glorified by the record of his deeds, of his sentiments, and of the very tender relationship which existed between him and all his colleagues in this great deliberative body.

First of all, I want to record my gratitude to him for the opportunity which was afforded me from time to time through many years to serve my country and my political party by virtue of his appointment. The relationship created by that appointment and my service in it was unique. I have been an advocate of causes almost all my life, for I began to practice law in my father's name before I was admitted to the bar, and I am accustomed to finding my fellow man tolerant, considerate, and able to get along with me in spite of the fact that he and I may represent opposing views on a controversial subject. But, Mr. President, I never in my life met

such a character as CHARLES McNARY for poise, equanimity, breadth of vision, judicial temperament, and utter willingness that I, though acting as his assistant, should hold views upon controversial subjects which were diametrically opposed to his. That relationship was one of the most beautiful things in my experience here of 13 years. I thank him for it, and I shall always appreciate it as one of the sustaining memories of our service in this great body.

That was a quality which enabled him to hold together a group of men who differed upon vital questions that were made prominent by the fact that we were either approaching war or that we were indeed in war. No man here has sought to escape responsibility in this terrible situation created by the war, and no man here has been able to escape some of the wear and tear caused by the stresses of the war. I regret to say that I believe that perhaps our friend might have been able to live longer and continue to contribute his marvelous services to his country had it not been for the great pressures which were brought upon him by the circumstances that grew out of the war.

Our mourning for him is filled with praise, and if we can by what we say erect a memorial to his honor, we do it here and now.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I am aware of the fact that no words of mine would avail to add anything to the splendid tributes which have been paid Senator McNARY. At the same time I feel that in honor to his virtues and in honor to his great services it would be proper for me to call the attention of the Senate to one service which Senator McNARY rendered for which he will always be held in high regard. He and I served for many years as vice chairmen of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission. In the erection of the memorial to Jefferson it was the aim of Senator McNARY that while it should honor Jefferson it should also be a memorial to the American people. Senator McNARY strove and worked to cause the memorial to reflect the ideals which have always been America's, so that posterity might understand them, and so that the memorial, which represents America at its best, may be a shining beacon for the whole world to see and to honor.

When it came to constructing the statue, Senator McNARY was interested in seeing that Jefferson the citizen should be honored. So the statue represents the great American after his retirement from public life, but when he was still serving his country in an advisory capacity, giving of his wisdom and his experience, and passing his ideals on to his fellow men.

Mr. President, mankind needs men who can stand alone, and in CHARLES McNARY we saw such a man. Representing as he did the best of American ideals, he always appeared in our presence as one who could stand alone and he received the honor that was due him because he could and did stand alone.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, as one of the junior Members of the Senate, I wish to pay a personal tribute to the

leadership of Senator McNARY, and to express appreciation of the helpfulness which Senator McNARY uniformly displayed toward me and toward all others who have come to the Senate in recent years. During the 3 years I have been a Member of the Senate, he gave me advice and guidance which have been invaluable. More than that, he demonstrated to me what a Senator can do for his Nation through his service in the Senate. He earned, deserved, and enjoyed the confidence of the Senate and of the Nation, and he served in the Senate in a manner which enabled him to become a recognized leader in the Nation in the field he had chosen for his special service.

I had occasion recently to look up the nature of his committee service in the Senate. It is impressive in its lesson. During 14 consecutive Congresses he served as a member of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, and during 4 of those Congresses he served as its chairman. During 13 consecutive Congresses he served as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and during three and a fraction of those Congresses he served as its chairman. His chairmanship of that committee came to an end only when the majority of the Senate changed. From that time on, for 6 Congresses, he served as minority leader in the Senate. In addition, he served for 13 consecutive Congresses as a member of the Committee on Commerce.

By means of that continuity of service during practically a full generation he became an authority in the field of agriculture and its related fields in a manner which enabled him to render to this Nation a distinguished service. He thereby added to the confidence which the Nation feels and, I believe, which it has a right to feel in the Senate.

Also illustrative of the contribution which a man of that kind renders through his service to the Senate, I may add that he served as a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Commerce, the Committee on Fisheries, the Committee on Indian Affairs, the Committee to Investigate Unemployment and Relief, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on the Library, the Committee on Manufactures, the Committee on Mines and Mining, the Committee on Pacific Railroads, the Committee on the Philippines, the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine, the Committee on Public Lands, the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, the Select Committee on Government Organization, the Special Committee to Investigate Executive Agencies of Government, the Special Committee on Wildlife Resources, the Special Committee on the Survey of Land and Water Policies of the United States, the Special Silver Committee, the Special Committee to Investigate Agricultural Labor Shortages, and the Special Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning.

Senator McNARY was a symbol of integrity, fairness, kindness, modesty, tact, and friendship. He was a competent and intelligent public servant. He

honored the Senate by his service in it. He honored the Nation by his service to it.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, the announcement of the death of CHARLES L. McNARY came on that fateful Friday as a surprise and a shock to his colleagues in the Senate and to the people of the United States. We knew of his serious illness, but recent reports reaching us had led us to the fond hope that he was well on the road to recovery and would soon be filling again the seat which for many years he had occupied with so much honor to himself and credit to the party whose chosen leader he was upon this floor.

I was among countless others who looked upon CHARLEY McNARY as a true and sympathetic friend. When first I came to the Senate, in 1933, I was, just as the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] has today stated as his own experience, the recipient of his courtesy, his kindness, and his sympathetic counsel. I have more than once had occasion to appreciate the wise advice he gave me shortly after I entered this body. Speaking from a long legislative and public experience, his admonition was, in summary, that he who uses persuasion, rather than criticism, and who deals kindly, rather than harshly, with his colleagues will accomplish more and travel longer and farther than those who employ denunciation and abuse as their weapons.

To use the words of the tribute Hamlet paid to Horatio, I may say of CHARLEY McNARY that he was "e'en as just a man as e'er my conversation cop'd withal."

CHARLEY McNARY was a living exemplification of his own philosophy of life. He was firm but gentle, and mellowed his sternest opposition with a sweetness and kindness that left behind no sting, but only respect and esteem.

He readily distinguished between the good and the bad, and adhered to what was good, regardless of party or factional politics. He always placed his country above party, and his death marks the passing of a truly great American.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in the death of CHARLES McNARY the common people lost a true friend, a farsighted leader, and a relentless, untiring battler for agriculture. In his search for farming facts he visited the State of North Dakota 12 times.

The greatest tribute ever paid to him was his almost frantic selection as the Vice Presidential candidate. He was selected because those in control realized the tremendous hold he had on the minds and affections of the agricultural and laboring masses. He was not only absolutely honest but he was entirely fearless. Exceptionally well informed on economic and political matters, he gave the Republican Party a leadership which is greatly missed now, and will continue to be missed for a long time to come.

This Nation's leaders will be sorely pressed in trying to find leadership that will come anywhere near having the love, esteem, and confidence of the common people enjoyed by Senator McNARY for so long.

Experienced in statesmanship, entirely devoid of demagoguery, diplomatic and tactful, but realistic, in his approach, this great American citizen has left a record which will be an inspiration to the youth of America, and a career which every father will be proud to have his son copy.

Mr. President, this Christian gentleman was my reliable friend and counselor, and I mourn with the common people of this great country at our great loss of this heart-stirring, lovable character.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I am one of the newest Members of the Senate. Nevertheless, I join with all those who by their statements today have shown their great respect for CHARLEY McNARY. It was not necessary for one to know CHARLEY for a long time. His great qualities of friendliness, human kindness, and leadership made one feel instantly his great understanding and willingness to be helpful at all times. I valued his friendship and his always good counsel.

CHARLEY McNARY was a great friend of my father, who also has gone to the Great Beyond. I know this because I have been aware of their exchange of ideas for the past 20 years. Each of them understood the problems of those who till the soil, and each was always working for the benefit of the agriculturists and horticulturists. From South Dakota, since the untimely death of our leader, have come many letters of regret at the passing of this great and good man. Therefore, I know that all the people of my State join in the expression of sympathy to his family and share the feeling of great loss in his passing, as set forth in the resolution which I now present for the RECORD at this point:

Whereas the end of earthly life has come to the Honorable CHARLES McNARY, who has been the guiding hand of the Republican Party in the United States Senate: Be it

Resolved by the Beadle County, S. Dak., Republican Committee, That an expression of appreciation for his splendid party service be hereby made, as well as appreciation for his outstanding life as a successful American and Christian gentleman; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the South Dakota Members of the United States Senate, with the request that they inform the family of Senator McNARY regarding this expression of appreciation.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I wish to add my word of tribute to the memory of one whom we have loved long since and lost awhile—our friend CHARLEY McNARY.

Coming here as a new Senator, as I did 6 years ago, and having offices adjacent to his, it was often my privilege to consult with him on matters of legislation and procedure. I never knew a wiser counselor, and I never had a better friend.

Two outstanding characteristics marked the man's life and influenced the lives of his fellows—graciousness and kindness. They were outstanding attributes of the man. Those attributes, coupled with a rare judgment of men and issues, and a fine toleration for the other fellow's point of view, will live in memory down through the years.

Today I listened to ALBEN BARKLEY speak of the imminent approach to death and a man's viewpoint as the years pass by. As I grow older, it is not the transition of death which bothers me when those I have loved pass on, but rather it is the finality of the thing—the fact that never again in this world shall I look upon the face of mother, or friend, or loved one. So, when troubled by that thought, as I have been many times and very recently, there come to my mind words which I learned years ago, written by an anonymous author, which I leave with you:

A good man never dies;
In worthy deeds and prayer,
In helpful hands and honest eyes,
If smiles and tears be there;
Who lives for you and me
Lives for the world he tries to help;
He lives eternally.
A good man never dies.

CHARLEY McNARY was a good man in every sense of the word. So in a time of tragic sorrow, as we sit today in this Chamber, where he was wont to sit amongst us as our friend, counselor, and leader, it is not enough to go to earthly things for our comfort, but we turn to the eternal verities. So I sound a triumphant note that has blessed my life in times of sorrow, uttered by a great Christian 2,000 years ago, St. Paul, in his epistle to the Romans:

For I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.

So may we comfort one another with these words.

Mr. DANAHER subsequently said: Mr. President, when word of the passing of our late colleague, Senator CHARLES L. McNARY, reached the Senate, the opening prayer was delivered by our Chaplain, the Reverend Frederick Brown Harris. While the prayer itself appears in the RECORD, there was comment on it in a column which appeared in the Atlantic (Iowa) News-Telegram of March 7, written by E. P. Chase. It is so deserving of perpetuation that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD following this morning's eulogistic ceremonies.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WITH E. P. CHASE AT THE NATION'S CAPITAL

WASHINGTON, D. C.—More often than not the opening prayers in both the House and Senate are routine affairs and very few, if any of the Members know what is said. On occasion, however, the chaplains rise to considerable heights. That was true one day last week in the Senate when the Reverend Frederick Brown Harris, chaplain of that body, was most eloquent in his opening prayer. Senator CHARLEY McNARY, of Oregon, had just died and with simple dignity and most fitting words the chaplain arose to the occasion.

"Our Father God," he intoned, "we come with the solemn consciousness that swift to its close ebbs out life's little day, as once again in the passing of an honored Member of this body we bow before the mystery of death."

Then he continued on to his eulogy of a fellow Member all Senators had loved and respected. "The one clear call," said the chaplain, "has taken from us Thy faithful servant and our beloved friend with whom we took sweet counsel and whose tolerant outlook often turned the discords of dispute into the music of understanding. But the sorrow of our hearts pleads with us to bless Thee for the close ties which have been severed, for the sanctified wisdom and the pure humanity which made this radiant personality as the candle of the Lord."

"We remember with gratitude that for him party loyalty was ever but an altar of devotion in the greater temple of his undefiled patriotism. We remember today with joy his long and fruitful years as a public servant, his patient courage, his gentle courtesy, his constant consecration to his great trust. We remember gratefully now one who held his convictions firmly without questioning the sincerity of others whose quest of truth led them along other paths. We think of him today as one who could differ without anger, who could debate without bitterness, who could be defeated without rancor, who could win without exultation."

"So, one by one, Thou dost gather the scattered families out of the earthly light to the heavenly glory, from the distractions and strife and weariness of time to the peace of eternity. Vouchsafe unto his loved ones Thy tenderest mercies and the consolations of Thy sustaining grace. In Thy great mercy bring us all at last to the homeland of Thine eternal love. In the name of That One who hath brought light and immortality to life."

A great many fine things have been deservedly written and said about the late Senator McNARY, but I question that any encomium more beautiful will be pronounced for this very good man.

With his simple, yet eloquent, words this Senate chaplain unerringly cataloged the character of McNARY, enumerating the many qualities which endeared him to his fellows. And I was intrigued by that statement that "we come with the solemn consciousness that swift to its close ebbs out life's little day." That has all the rippling grandeur of the Elegy and the Essay on Man.

In the hurly-burly of legislative turmoil sometimes really big moments are often overlooked. To my notion this chaplain's tribute to a fine Senator and a good man was unforgettable.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I know that the people of Oregon in their sorrow are grateful for the eloquent and heartfelt tributes here paid to the memory of their most beloved and distinguished citizen. They are comforted in the knowledge that their loss and their grief are shared.

Mr. President, I have come into membership in this body with a heavy heart, for I know that death, which came first and opened the door, took so much and I can bring so little. I am heartened when I remember that there is before me—set by him who was your colleague, your friend and mine—a record of friendship and service and pure patriotism toward which it is a privilege for any man to aspire; and this is true though I realize that my feet may stumble where his were sure.

In my short time here many Members of both Houses have come to me to express their sense of personal loss in the passing of my distinguished predecessor, and each has spoken of some intimate personal memory, sacred to him alone; but they have been one in this regard, that all have spoken—and there was wonderment in their voices that it was

so—all have spoken of a great capacity for understanding and tolerance of men, men in their strength and their weakness, that was given CHARLES McNARY in so generous measure. They said it was an affirmative thing that flowed out from the man to quiet and subdue and to beget love.

I have faith that in the ominous days ahead, when we of this body, striving to fulfill to the utmost our duty as we severally see it, shall find ourselves with convictions opposed, with wills that clash and hot words that seek utterance, the memory of CHARLES McNARY may come and abide in this Chamber, to chasten and soften and again point the way.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

DAMAGE CLAIMS, WAR DEPARTMENT (S. Doc. No. 167)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an estimate of appropriation submitted by the War Department to pay claims for damages to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death, amounting to \$75,286.98 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

JUDGMENTS RENDERED AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT BY DISTRICT COURTS (S. Doc. No. 168)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, records of judgments rendered against the Government by district courts, amounting to \$3,625 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

DAMAGE CLAIMS, NAVY DEPARTMENT (S. Doc. No. 169)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Navy Department to pay claims for damages incident to the operation of vessels in the Navy, amounting to \$5,994.03 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

DAMAGE CLAIMS, COAST GUARD (S. Doc. No. 170)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Navy Department to pay a claim for damages incident to the operation of vessels of the United States Coast Guard, amounting to \$500 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PROPERTY DAMAGE CLAIMS (S. Doc. No. 171)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, estimates of appropriations to pay claims for damages to privately owned property, amounting to \$6,756 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CLAIM FOR DAMAGE TO ROADS AND HIGHWAYS OF STATES (S. Doc. No. 172)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Public Roads Administration to pay a claim for damage to roads and highways of States, amounting to \$4,093.62 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE (S. Doc. No. 173)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, estimates of appropriation to cover claims allowed by the General Accounting Office, amounting to \$362,387.16 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

JUDGMENTS RENDERED BY THE COURT OF CLAIMS (S. Doc. No. 174)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a schedule of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims, amounting to \$9,397.37 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (S. Doc. No. 175)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the District of Columbia, fiscal year 1944, amounting to \$6,000 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

LEGISLATION BY A MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, an interim report of the operations of the Farm Credit Administration during the calendar year 1943 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS OF A COMMISSION

A letter from the Assistant Secretary-Treasurer of the American Commission for the Protection and Salvage of Artistic and Historic Monuments in Europe, transmitting, pursuant to law, an estimate of personnel requirements for that Commission for the quarter ending June 30, 1944 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Civil Service.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of the Treasury, Navy (4), Interior, and Agriculture (3), and the National Archives which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Metropolitan Council of Exchange Clubs, Detroit, Mich., protesting against the enactment of the bill (H. R. 3420) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes, or any other legislation affecting aviation until at least 6 months after the termination of the present war; to the Committee on Commerce.

A letter from Raymond F. Wade, SK 3/c, United States Navy, Port Hueneme, Calif.,

relating to the matter of dependents' allowances to motherless children; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A letter in the nature of a petition from Albert L. Sklar, of Baltimore, Md., praying for the adoption of the resolution (S. Res. 247) favoring action by the United States looking to the restoration of Palestine as a homeland for the Jewish people; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Michigan; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Concurrent Resolution 6

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation simplifying income tax return blanks

"Whereas the income tax return blanks now required to be filled out by the public are not only complicated and difficult to understand, but almost impossible for the people to file without the assistance of experts; and

"Whereas taxation, although a proper burden on the public and one the public is willing to bear, should be so imposed that the taxpayer understands the tax he is paying; and

"Whereas no confusion should exist with respect to the filling out of income tax returns, in order that the public may understand the tax being paid, and the Government may receive needed revenues: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the members of the Michigan Legislature earnestly urge the Congress of the United States to enact legislation simplifying income tax return blanks so that the public may understand the tax being paid and may be able to comply with the requirements incident to the preparation of the return; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives in Congress; and to the Michigan Members in the Senate and House of Representatives of Congress."

RESOLUTIONS BY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF WASHINGTON

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, recently the House of Representatives of the State of Washington adopted two resolutions. They were sent to me and I should like to have them printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred and I ask unanimous consent that such procedure be followed.

One of the resolutions asks Congress to reduce the voting age of young men to 18 years of age. The other resolution is a request to Congress for assistance in the creation of a four-lane Pacific highway from Seattle to Vancouver, Wash., the purpose being to seek Federal funds.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolutions will be received, appropriately referred, and under the rule, printed in the RECORD.

To the Committee on the Judiciary:

Whereas Senator HARVEY KILGORE has introduced into the United States Senate S. Res. 89, calling for the submission by the Congress of the United States to the various State legislatures of a constitutional amendment providing for lowering the voting age to 18; and

Whereas of the 7,000,000 young men and women in our country between 18 and 21, nearly 3,000,000 of them are in the armed forces, and of the other 4,000,000 the majority

are working in the war plants of our Nation, buying bonds, paying income tax, and in many other ways assuming the full responsibility of adulthood; and

Whereas passage of such a constitutional amendment will demonstrate to these 18-year-olds in the Army the recognition by their country that if they are "old enough to fight they are old enough to vote," and will contribute directly to building their morale and devotion to and interest in American democracy, and the same will apply to the 18-year-olds in war plants and other jobs; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives go on record calling upon the House and Senate of the United States Congress to pass S. Res. 89, and submit to the various State legislatures the lowering of voting age to 18 as a constitutional amendment.

To the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Washington in extraordinary legislative session assembled:

Whereas the completion of the four-lane Pacific Highway from Seattle to Vancouver, Wash., is of paramount importance to the successful prosecution of the war insofar as it serves as the major transportation route in the Northwest; and

Whereas Members of the United States Congress from the State of Washington are urging the project's completion; and

Whereas the War Department and the War Production Board must certify the project as essential before Federal funds for use on the project are allocated; and

Whereas the Department of Highways of the State of Washington and the Washington State Good Roads Association are using all possible influence to secure the allocation of said Federal funds and the certification of the project's essentiality: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the State of Washington in legislative session assembled go on record as urging all possible support be given the department of highways toward the securing of project certification and an allocation of Federal funds; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the house of representatives be directed to transmit to the Department of Highways of the State of Washington, the Washington State congressional delegation, and the War Production Board a copy of the foregoing resolution.

PALESTINE, THE JEWISH HOMELAND— RESOLUTION FROM LEGISLATURE OF WASHINGTON

Mr. BONE. Another resolution from the Washington State Legislature came to me which was in the form of a memorial to the Congress to reaffirm its position that Palestine should be opened as the Jewish homeland, but I note that one of my colleagues in the House of Representatives, Representative MAGNUSON, has caused this resolution previously to be inserted in the RECORD, and, therefore, I merely make reference to it now.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN:

From the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 3847. A bill to exempt certain officers and employees of the Office of Price Administration from certain provisions of the Criminal Code and Revised Statutes; without amendment (Rept. No. 753).

From the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 2618. A bill to regulate the placing of children in family homes, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 754).

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY AND SURVEY PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, a few years ago the Congress was deluged with protests from businessmen of the country asserting that they were being virtually smothered by a flood of demands from Government agencies for reports, inventories, and questionnaires on nearly every conceivable subject relating to their business activities, or remotely connected therewith. Small concerns with meager bookkeeping facilities were being asked to render complicated reports relating to their business operations. They were required to give the most detailed explanations consuming much of their time and attention. These demands were frequently unnecessary and created such a burden on small business that they appealed to the Congress for relief.

In response to this public clamor, the Senate Special Committee on Small Business Problems entered into a study of the situation and reported a bill to the Senate known as the Federal Reports Act, which was enacted into law approximately 18 months ago—Public Law 831.

This legislation was designed to put an end to demands for unnecessary reports and questionnaires, and provide a system by which the various Government agencies would be enabled to secure all necessary information they required without placing such a burden upon the business concerns of the country. At that time the whole country seemed to be wincing under the burdens of the demands of these inquisitorial Federal agencies seeking information which in many instances appeared to be already available to them in the filing cabinets and on the shelves of other Government departments and bureaus.

It has been quite some time now since Senators have been bothered by these complaints, which were so numerous just a few months ago. The explanation is in the Federal Reports Act itself. In this connection, let me read a single paragraph from the letter of transmittal by Harold D. Smith, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, who has sent this report to me in response to my request for periodic information on the administration of the act. Mr. Smith makes this statement:

I should like to add to these reports my own observation that the Federal Reports Act has been highly successful in getting at the reporting problems facing the country as a result of the war emergency. The burden on respondents has been greatly reduced during the year, Government operations have been simplified, and the quality of information has been improved. It has become increasingly clear that the legislation was both wise and timely.

Mr. Smith, in his appraisal of the act, has not alone accepted the favorable manifestations which are so apparent in Washington. He sent investigators out into the industrial field to determine in an impartial way the effect produced by

the law's operations. These men have returned with reports to the effect that without a single exception every person contacted expressed the opinion that there has been "a remarkable reduction and improvement in questionnaires and in record-keeping or reporting requirements."

Moreover, these examinations in the field have demonstrated that the requests emanating from the Capital have become more reasonable, forms have been simplified, and the burden correspondingly reduced. But, best of all, there is a distinct reflection that business and industry is now better equipped and adapted to keeping records of the kind currently being required by the Government.

All in all, the intelligence conveyed in this report is pleasing not only to myself, as chairman, but to the entire membership of the Senate Special Committee to Study Problems of Small Business. The Federal Reports Act, as Senators know, was one of the first pieces of legislation to be formulated by our committee and receive the sanction of Congress and the administration. We will be, I trust, pardoned if we take our portion of credit and indicate a modicum of pride in the beneficial results already obtained.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report—brief for a document of this importance—be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

REPORT OF PROGRESS UNDER THE FEDERAL REPORTS ACT

The Federal Reports Act, signed on December 24, 1942, has been in effect almost exactly 1 year. We are, therefore, presenting a summary picture of the results achieved during this period.

Three principal assignments were given to the Bureau of the Budget by the Federal Reports Act as means of effectuating its broad function of coordinating the Federal statistical services: (1) The elimination of duplication in and the simplification of Federal reporting requirements; (2) the establishment of central collecting agencies to serve the needs of two or more agencies; and (3) the development of arrangements for the joint use of data. It is upon the first of these that the Bureau has concentrated attention and made the most progress during the first year of operation under the act. The pressure of administrative needs for data on which to base urgent war programs has required that our limited staff time be principally devoted to the review of report forms and reporting requirements, and to the development of controls over the issuance of requests for information. Several measures have been adopted to establish effective control.

1. Approval number system: The approval number system is the most important procedure in the Bureau's control mechanism. The fact that all authorized forms carry an approval number gives respondents some assurance that the forms are necessary to the war effort and request a minimum of information. It is true that business concerns and individuals still have to reply to many report forms, but the criticism of report forms has subsided in large part with the realization that there is an orderly review

process and that forms are subject to a careful screening process before they are issued. The wide publicity given to the system has resulted in referral of forms which lack approval numbers to the Bureau for investigation. Although Government agencies, principally field offices, have issued some unauthorized requests for information, they have been cooperative in withdrawing the forms upon investigation by the Bureau.

2. Internal control units: In order to locate initial responsibility close to the scene of operations, the Bureau has actively promoted the establishment of a unit in each of the larger operating agencies to provide for internal clearance and control over report forms originating in subordinate units. Only forms approved by these units are submitted to the Bureau for final approval by the agencies where the control units have been established. At present there are 15 such control units which give an initial screening to 90 percent of all forms received for review.

3. Advisory committee on Government questionnaires: The advisory committee, composed of representatives of national business organizations and established at the request of the Director of the Bureau, has contributed materially to the Bureau's accomplishments by making practical recommendations with regard to important reporting programs, particularly those of the war agencies. Special attention is devoted to the availability of data in business records. The committee's experience has demonstrated that this kind of cooperative relationship and constructive advice can do much to further a satisfactory solution to the problem of Government questionnaires. Approximately 40 special subcommittees have been appointed by the advisory committee on Government questionnaires to study special problems or problems affecting particular industries. These subcommittees have enlisted the active participation of more than 200 businessmen. The entire expense of the advisory committee on Government questionnaires has been met by industry in recognition of the joint interest of business in the improvement of reporting forms.

SUMMARY OF OPERATIONS

The Bureau's records show that during the calendar year 1943 it acted upon 7,484 forms. This figure does not, of course, include the forms which were disapproved by the internal control units of Federal agencies in accordance with the Bureau's standards. The following table summarizes the Bureau's actions:

	Total actions	Approved	Disapproved	Percent disapproved
New repetitive forms.....	1,934	1,660	274	14.2
Revised repetitive forms.....	4,063	3,699	364	9.0
Single-time forms.....	1,487	1,218	269	18.1
Total.....	7,484	6,577	907	12.1

The following table summarizes the above actions by general purpose or type of form:

	Total actions	Approved	Disapproved	Percent disapproved
Application forms.....	1,351	1,262	89	6.6
Forms providing administrative data.....	3,285	2,825	460	14.0
Reporting requirements in orders, etc.....	516	483	33	6.4
Forms providing data for general uses.....	2,332	2,007	325	13.9
Total.....	7,484	6,577	907	12.1

The 364 revised repetitive forms proposed for further use which were disapproved represent an existing reporting burden which has been eliminated. In addition to this number of forms for which extension was refused by the Bureau of the Budget, almost 800 forms were discontinued by the agencies themselves. Most repetitive forms now in use in the important war agencies are reviewed every 6 or 12 months to insure that collections of information once necessary are not routinely continued beyond the real need for them. Disapprovals of new repetitive forms and of single-time forms, designed for use only once, likewise represent a reduction in reporting burden.

It must be emphasized again that the number of formal disapprovals does not include the number of forms disapproved by the internal control units, and hence never submitted to the Bureau for formal action. Nor does it include cases in which the Bureau is consulted informally about a proposed project before it has reached the stage of formal drafting. An expression of disapproval at this point frequently leads to the abandonment of the plans without a formal submittal. The increasing understanding on the part of Federal agencies of the standards set by the Bureau leads to more critical scrutiny by the agencies themselves so that the number of poorly planned projects which would inevitably be disapproved has declined. The very existence of an exacting control mechanism has in itself brought about a reduction in the number of requests for the Bureau's approval. This is evidenced by the fact that during the first quarter of 1943 14 percent of the forms submitted were disapproved, as compared with 9.8 percent during the last quarter, despite the fact that the standards imposed in the latter part of the year were much more rigorous than those imposed earlier.

The review activity figures also fail to reflect the many important modifications made to simplify report forms, thereby reducing the cost and burden. After the need for a particular reporting program is established and the program is shown to be generally feasible, the main work of the Bureau centers around simplification and the development of standards. More than 20 percent of the forms finally approved are changed in important respects. The application of standards of performance, the unification of uncoordinated or duplicating programs of information, and the careful scrutiny of all requests result in basic modifications.

The number of respondents may be reduced through the establishment of a cut-off point to eliminate the small businesses, or those having insignificant relationship to the problem under study; a change in the frequency may be effected so that fewer reports are required; arrangements may be made for the joint use of a form by several agencies rather than allowing each agency to collect its own information; reporting systems may be made less burdensome by the elimination of unnecessary forms or requirements or by simplifying the forms and records. Modifications of these types result directly in substantial reductions in the burden of reporting information to the Government.

The Bureau's figures show that as of January 1, 1944, there were 5,105 public use forms and reporting requirements in active use by Federal agencies. On January 1, 1943, there were 4,256 in use. These figures are not strictly comparable because figures on reporting and record-keeping requirements, which numbered 343 on January 1, 1944, are not included in the figure for January 1, 1943. The Bureau did not review such requirements in 1942, prior to the passage of the Federal Reports Act. The war agencies and the Department of Agriculture account for 95 percent of the increase in the number of report forms in use.

Because of the necessity for primary emphasis on the review and control phase of the Bureau's functions, the other two major coordinating functions have been developed more slowly. Except as individual report forms covering the same subject matter come up for review at the same time, our progress upon the development of single collecting agencies has been piecemeal. Our experience so far, however, indicates that the ultimate accomplishments from a wider application of the Federal Reports Act should be large. Orderly arrangements for the collection of information will produce more lasting economies and improvements than the day-to-day approval of individual forms.

With regard to arrangements for joint use of information, some progress has been made, particularly in respect to contract renegotiation reporting, to subcontractor reporting and to some of the price and distribution controls applied to the food program. Vigorous action is required on the part of the Bureau to promote further development in this direction and to remove the existing barriers. We expect to increase the allotment of time for this purpose as rapidly as staff time becomes available.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 1779. A bill to provide for a new base period, and for considering increases in the cost of farm labor, in determining parity prices for agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1780. A bill to exempt certain officers and employees of the National War Labor Board from certain provisions of the Criminal Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1781. A bill to provide for full military rank for members of the Army Nurse Corps, dietitians, and physical-therapy aides, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Idaho:

S. 1782. A bill to amend sections 4, 7, and 17 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) for the purpose of extending the time in which amendatory contracts may be made, and for other related purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 1783. A bill to confer authority on the Secretary of the Interior with regard to certain reclamation repayment contracts; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 1784. A bill for the relief of Leola Evans; and

S. 1785. A bill for the relief of Alex Wylie; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 1786. A bill to provide that members of the Florida State militia company, known as the Jasper Blues, shall be credited with service in the United States Army during the War with Spain; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(Mr. TOBEY introduced Senate bill 1787, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

COMBAT PAY FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide additional pay for members of the armed forces who engage in combat service,

and I request that the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be received, appropriately referred, and printed in the RECORD as requested by the Senator from New Hampshire.

The bill (S. 1787) to provide additional pay for members of the armed forces engaged in combat service was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 18 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, is amended by adding at the end of such section a new paragraph as follows:

"Officers, warrant officers, nurses, and enlisted men of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act and members of the Reserve forces of such services, and the National Guard, who are not receiving additional pay under the foregoing provisions of this section, the provisions of the act of April 9, 1928 (45 Stat. 412), as amended, or the provisions of the act of April 10, 1943 (Public Law 23, 78th Cong.), shall receive an increase of 50 percent of their pay when by orders of competent authority they are required to participate regularly and frequently in actual combat against the enemy or to serve regularly and frequently in immediate combat areas with troops engaged in actual combat against the enemy. Regulations in execution of the provisions of this paragraph shall be made by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy and shall, whenever practicable in their judgment, be uniform for all of the services concerned."

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, an article by Ernie Pyle. The article is entitled "He Goes to Bat for Fight Pay for Combat Ground Soldiers."

Mr. President, the bill I have just introduced will provide for a 50-percent increase in the pay of our combat ground soldiers. The bill is in line with common justice and appreciation, in my judgment; and under its provisions the same pay we are now giving as an increase to the men in the combat flying service will accrue to the men in the combat ground service. We call it flight pay, akin to the flight pay now authorized for flying combat men.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the article will be printed in the RECORD.

The article referred to is as follows:

ERNIE PYLE—HE GOES TO BAT FOR FIGHT PAY FOR COMBAT GROUND SOLDIERS

In Italy.—In my usual role of running other people's business I've been thrashing around with an idea—honest. It's to give the combat soldier some little form of recognition more than he is getting now.

Everybody who serves overseas, no matter where or what he's doing, gets extra pay. Enlisted men get 20 percent additional and officers 10 percent.

Airmen get an extra 50 percent above this for flight pay. As a result, officer-flyers get 60 percent above their normal base pay and enlisted flyers such as gunners and radio operators get 70 percent.

All that is fine and as it should be, but the idea I was toying with is why not give your genuine combat ground soldier something corresponding to flight pay? Maybe a good phrase for it would be "fight pay."

Of any 1,000,000 men overseas, probably no more than 100,000 are in actual combat with the enemy. But as it is now, there is no official distinction between the dogface lying for days and nights under constant mortar fire on an Italian hill and the headquarters clerk living comfortably in a hotel in Rio de Janeiro.

Their two worlds are so far apart the human mind can barely grasp the magnitude of the difference. One lives like a beast and dies in great numbers. The other is merely working away from home. Both are doing necessary jobs, but it seems to me the actual warrior deserves something to set him apart. And medals are not enough.

When I was at the front the last time several infantry officers brought up this same suggestion. They say combat pay would mean a lot to the fighting man. It would put him into a proud category and make him feel that somebody appreciates what he endures.

Obviously no soldier would ever go into combat just to get extra flight pay. That isn't the point. There is not enough money in the world to pay any single individual his due for battle suffering.

But it would put a mark of distinction on him, a recognition that his miserable job was a royal one and that the rest of us were aware of it.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 4377. An act authorizing the President to present, in the name of Congress, a Distinguished Service Medal to Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 4410. An act to extend for an additional 90 days the period during which certain grains and other products to be used for livestock and poultry feed may be imported from foreign countries free of duty; to the Committee on Finance.

COMMEMORATION OF CENTENNIAL OF THE TELEGRAPH

Mr. WHEELER submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 39), which was referred to the Committee on the Library:

Whereas Samuel F. B. Morse, a distinguished American artist, invented the first practical electro-magnetic telegraph in the winter of 1835-36, and obtained an appropriation from the Congress of the United States in 1843 for the construction of an experimental telegraph line between Baltimore, Md., and Washington, D. C.; and

Whereas the first telegram, "What Hath God Wrought?" was sent over this line from the old Supreme Court room in the Capitol to Baltimore on May 24, 1844; and

Whereas the sending of the first telegram marked the beginning of the telegraph industry, which has been indispensable to the country in four wars and, by linking all sections, has implemented the traditional motto, "E Pluribus Unum"; and

Whereas the telegraph was the first speedy means of communication connecting the nations of the world, bringing all peoples closer together, and promoting the dissemination of ideas as well as international trade; and

Whereas the telegraph was the first great electrical discovery and was the forerunner of our entire system of electrical communications, including the telephone, the radio, and television; Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there is hereby created a joint congressional committee to be composed of five Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and five Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Such committee

shall secure an appropriate plaque or other suitable memorial to be placed in or near the room in the Capitol from which the first telegraph message was dispatched, and shall arrange for appropriate exercises, to be held on May 24, 1944, for the purpose of placing such plaque or other memorial and commemorating the centennial of the telegraph. The cost of carrying out the provisions of this concurrent resolution, including the cost of such plaque or other memorial, not to exceed \$4,000, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the House and one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate.

INVESTIGATION OF LABOR SHORTAGE IN THE PACIFIC COAST AND ROCKY MOUNTAIN STATES—LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. DOWNEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 270), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the limit of expenditures of the Committee on Military Affairs under Senate Resolution 88, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to February 25, 1943 (relating to an investigation of the existing shortage of labor in the Pacific Coast and Rocky Mountain States and the effect of such shortage upon the war effort), as supplemented by Senate Resolution 113, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to April 7, 1943, is hereby increased by \$2,500.

COST OF PRODUCTION OF CUT DIAMONDS

Mr. PEPPER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 271), which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

Resolved, That the United States Tariff Commission is hereby directed to investigate, for the purposes of section 336 of the Tariff Act of 1930, the differences in cost of production of cut diamonds produced in the United States and like or similar foreign-produced articles; and, to take adequate steps permitted by law to protect labor standards in the diamond processing industry if its future is thereby found to be menaced.

INCREASED PURCHASING POWER—DESIRABILITY OF THE TOWNSEND PLAN BILL

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, America is winning this war on all fronts, thanks to the foresightedness and the judgment of her national leadership. We are heading—rapidly, we hope—into an era of peacetime when our boys and girls will come home from the fighting fronts to resume their rightful places in our society.

To what sort of society will our boys and girls return? Will it be a society in which factories have closed down for lack of further war orders; in which defense industries close down and hold up reconversion because they can see no market for consumer goods; in which our returning veterans will be compelled to sell apples on street corners for a living? Or will it be to an economy of scarcity—planned for and legislated for in exactly the same way we approached our war problem? For peace and plenty are things that can be planned for and legislated for.

If we act now to provide a constant stream of purchasing power passing through the hands of those laid off by industry, we will assure a market for the goods of business and industry, and will give our defense plants good reason for hurrying their reconversion when that wonderful day of peace arrives.

We can provide a big, growing stream of purchasing power every month to our aged, our incapacitated, our blind, and our chronically ill by passing the Townsend plan bill, House bill 1649. I urge it upon my colleagues for their careful study and consideration.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR OVERTON—EDITORIAL FROM SHREVEPORT (LA.) TIMES

[Mr. ELLENDER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Senator Overton," published in the Shreveport (La.) Times of Tuesday, March 14, which appears in the Appendix.]

WILLIAM F. CODY—BUFFALO BILL

[Mr. ROBERTSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by him at Cody, Wyo., on February 26, 1944, on the occasion of the celebration of the anniversary of the birth of William F. Cody which appears in the Appendix.]

ANDREW JACKSON—ARTICLE BY SENATOR HATCH

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article on Andrew Jackson, written by Senator Hatch and published in the Washington Evening Star of March 15, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

GRADUATION ADDRESS BY VICE ADMIRAL RANDALL JACOBS, UNITED STATES NAVY

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Vice Admiral Randall Jacobs, United States Navy, Chief of Naval Personnel, at the graduation and commissioning exercises of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps and V-12 Units at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, February 25, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

HEALTH PROVISIONS OF THE WAGNER-MURRAY-DINGELL BILL

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a series of questions and answers prepared by him dealing with the provisions of the so-called Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, which appears in the Appendix.]

FOUR FREEDOMS ON THE HOME FRONT

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to United States Senators and Representatives, dated February 22, 1944, from Four Freedoms on the Home Front Committee, which appears in the Appendix.]

WILL THEY VOTE?—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEWARK EVENING NEWS

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Will They Vote?" from the Newark Evening News of March 15, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE FOURTH TERM—DEBATE IN PRINT BETWEEN SENATOR MEAD AND SENATOR BRIDGES

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a debate in print between himself and Senator Mead on the subject Should There Be a Fourth Term? published in Town Meetings in Print, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROTECTION OF CONGRESSIONAL GOVERNMENT

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Detroit Times of March 10 entitled "Bridges Asks Crusade To Protect Our Congressional Government," which appears in the Appendix.]

DEMobilizing THE NEW DEAL—EDITORIAL FROM LOS ANGELES EXAMINER

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Demobilizing the New Deal," published in the Los Angeles Examiner, which appears in the Appendix.]

CIVILIAN CONTRIBUTION TO THE WAR EFFORT

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a resume of the booklet entitled "Bill Bailey Got the Credit, But the Man Behind the Gun Was Mr. Dooley," recently published by the General Cable Corporation in New York, which appears in the Appendix.]

COTTON AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT—ARTICLE BY O. F. BLEDSOE III

[Mr. EASTLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Cotton and the Federal Government," by O. F. Bledsoe III, of Greenwood, Miss., which appears in the Appendix.]

EXECUTIVE AND INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4070) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive, bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRIDGES in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Ferguson	Radcliffe
Andrews	George	Revercomb
Austin	Gillette	Reynolds
Bailey	Gurney	Robertson
Bankhead	Hatch	Russell
Barkley	Hawkes	Shipstead
Bilbo	Hayden	Stewart
Bone	Hill	Taft
Brewster	Holman	Thomas, Idaho
Bridges	Jackson	Thomas, Okla.
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Utah
Buck	Kilgore	Tobey
Burton	La Follette	Tunnell
Bushfield	Langer	Tydings
Byrd	McCarran	Vandenberg
Capper	McClellan	Wagner
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Walsh, N. J.
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Weeks
Connally	Maloney	Wheeler
Cordon	Mead	Wherry
Danaher	Millikin	White
Davis	Murray	Willis
Downey	O'Mahoney	Wilson
Eastland	Overton	
Ellender	Pepper	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EASTLAND in the chair). Seventy-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will proceed to state the amendments reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—Executive Office of the President—Bureau of the Budget", on page 3, line 18, after the word "refer-

ence", to strike out "periodicals and newspapers (not exceeding \$500)" and insert "and periodicals"; in line 19, before the word "maintenance", to strike out "teletype news service"; in line 21, after the word "use", to strike out "and not to exceed \$55,000 for temporary employment of persons or organizations by contract or otherwise without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, \$2,290,340" and insert "\$1,830,400", and on page 4, line 1, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out the comma and "of which \$44,940 shall be allocated to the Federal Board of Hospitalization."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 8, after the word "available" to strike out the comma and "and including the temporary employment (not exceeding \$65,000) of persons or organizations by contract or otherwise, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended"; and in line 19, after the figures "\$879,800", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "Provided, That upon the expiration of 60 days after the cessation of hostilities between the United States and the principal enemy powers or after the date of an armistice between the United States and the principal enemy powers, this appropriation shall cease to be available for obligations unless Congress shall otherwise provide by law."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 5, to insert:

No part of the appropriations herein made to the Bureau of the Budget shall be used for the maintenance or establishment of regional, field, or any other offices outside the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Civil Service Commission," on page 7, line 12, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$2,500"; and on page 8, line 4, after the word "charts", to strike out "purchase."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, in line 6, after the word "binding", to strike out "\$6,056,473" and insert "\$5,516,223."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, on page 8, in lieu of the committee amendment appearing in line 6, the committee has authorized me to present another amendment, which I now do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 8, line 6, after the word "binding", it is proposed to strike out "\$6,056,473" and insert in lieu thereof "\$5,766,000."

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, as I understand, the amendment now submitted by the Senator from Tennessee is a compromise which was arrived at in the committee and it is a figure in between the House figure and that previously adopted by the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is entirely correct. It was arrived at at a subsequent meeting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amend-

ment offered by the Senator from Tennessee to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 11, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$113,000" and insert "\$90,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 11, after the word "binding", to strike out "\$12,995,504" and insert "\$8,000,000."

Mr. McKELLAR. In lieu of the amendment just stated, I am authorized by the committee to offer an amendment, which is likewise a compromise adjustment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In lieu of the committee amendment, on page 9, line 11, it is proposed to strike out "\$12,995,504" and insert "\$8,840,000."

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I understand that this amendment carries a new figure which was agreed upon in the committee at a second meeting.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I desire to object to the amendment. Will it go over or what will be the disposition of it?

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senate will vote on it, unless the Senator desires to make a speech.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, the Committee on Appropriations—

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, as this is a very important matter, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Ferguson	Radcliffe
Andrews	George	Revercomb
Austin	Gillette	Reynolds
Bailey	Gurney	Robertson
Bankhead	Hatch	Russell
Barkley	Hawkes	Shipstead
Bilbo	Hayden	Stewart
Bone	Hill	Taft
Brewster	Holman	Thomas, Idaho
Bridges	Jackson	Thomas, Okla.
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Utah
Buck	Kilgore	Tobey
Burton	La Follette	Tunnell
Bushfield	Langer	Tydings
Byrd	McCarran	Vandenberg
Capper	McClellan	Wagner
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Walsh, N. J.
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Weeks
Connally	Maloney	Wheeler
Cordon	Mead	Wherry
Danaher	Millikin	White
Davis	Murray	Willis
Downey	O'Mahoney	Wilson
Eastland	Overton	
Ellender	Pepper	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, the Committee on Appropriations, in reporting to the Senate the independent offices appropriation bill, H. R. 4070, proposed an amendment on page 9, line 11, which would have the effect of reducing the Civil Service Commission's appropriations for "Salaries and expenses, national defense" from \$12,995,504 to \$8,000,000.

Since reporting the bill to the Senate the Committee has given further consideration to this item, and its acting chairman has just proposed an amendment which would increase the amount proposed for the Commission from \$8,000,000 to \$8,840,000.

If the Senate accepts the recommendation of the Appropriations Committee and appropriates only \$8,840,000 to the Civil Service Commission for its national defense activity, it is my understanding that the Commission will be in the position that at least \$1,890,000 will no longer be available for its activities in connection with the recruiting of persons for the war agencies.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am proposing that we strike out the amount of \$8,840,000 and substitute for it the amount of \$10,730,000.

This would put the Civil Service Commission in a position where it could continue to render the service in the field of recruiting and placement which is so desperately needed by the war agencies of the Government.

As chairman of the Civil Service Committee of the Senate, I am in a position to know that, throughout this war period, the Commission has, if anything, been undermanned in connection with its recruitment and placement work.

As a result of several investigations in California, I am especially familiar with conditions in my State. The Commission's office, located in San Francisco, which serves the State of California, has carried a far heavier load in connection with its recruiting work than any group of human beings should be called upon to carry. They have done an amazingly effective job, operating under severe handicaps, and without adequate resources. It is my understanding that what is true in connection with this office is likewise true in connection with the work of many of the Commission's other offices.

In asking for funds for its recruiting and placement work for the war agencies, the Commission has always predicated its request on the estimated number of placements it would be called upon to make in the Federal service over a given period. Not once since the war began has the Commission overestimated its anticipated work load. In every instance it has underestimated that load.

It is in the light of this record that I desire to have the Members of the Senate consider the basis for the Commission's request for funds for recruiting for the fiscal year 1945.

In submitting its request for funds for 1945 to the Bureau of the Budget, the Commission estimated that it would be called upon to make 1,548,000 placements for 1945. Between the time when these requests were submitted and hearings were held on the Commission's request before the House Committee on Appropriations, the Commission decided, on the basis of its current experiences, that in all probability it would be called upon to make 1,485,000 placements in 1945. Consequently, on its own initiative, the Commission asked the House Committee on Appropriations to approve \$272,043 less than the amount submitted

to the Congress as a result of the hearings before the Bureau of the Budget.

I refer to this for the purpose of indicating that the Civil Service Commission does make a conscientious effort to keep its requests for funds in line with its anticipated workload.

In estimating the number of placements which it feels will be made in 1945, the Commission has assumed that there will be a decrease in total Federal employment of approximately 250,000, as compared with the peak reached in June 1943. Consequently, the Commission believes that virtually all its recruiting work in 1945 will be for the purpose of making replacements. Under such circumstances the important factor in determining just what the work load will be is the turn-over rate. The Commission estimates are based on the assumption that this turn-over rate in 1945 will average 4½ percent a month. Actually, the Commission's experiences up to the present time reflect an average turn-over rate of better than 5 percent a month.

Having made what it seems to me is a very conservative estimate of the number of placements which will be made in 1945, the Commission's justifications then indicate that the cost per placement for 1945 will be \$4.42. To my mind, this is a low cost, when we consider the difficulties all employers are having at the present time in obtaining qualified personnel. At no time in the hearings before either the House Committee on Appropriations or at the hearings before the Senate Committee on Appropriations have these cost figures been called into question.

Unless the amount of \$1,890,000 shall be restored, as proposed by the amendment which I am offering, it will mean that the Civil Service Commission, instead of making 1,485,000 placements, will be able to make only 1,000,000 placements. In other words, we will be putting the Commission in a position where it will be virtually impossible for it to make 500,000 replacements in key war agencies.

Let us remember that this is not a question of providing the Commission with funds to recruit persons to take care of any proposed increase in Federal employment. This estimate rests on the premise that Federal employment will decline 250,000 as compared with the peak reached in June 1943. These funds are being requested solely for the purpose of making replacements in key war agencies.

Right now, for example, the Civil Service Commission is engaged in an intensive recruiting program in order to find persons for work at the Pearl Harbor Navy Yard. Certainly there is no question in the mind of anyone about the absolute necessity of meeting the Navy's needs as far as the staffing of this yard is concerned. Furthermore, this is not a need that is going to be taken care of once for all during the next few months. Literally thousands of persons now working in the Pearl Harbor Navy Yard will ultimately be inducted into the armed forces. Others having spent 18 months or more working in the Pearl Harbor Navy Yard will return to the mainland.

The Civil Service Commission will be expected to find the replacements for these workers. If it does not, it will be criticized and criticized in a vigorous manner by the Members of Congress. And yet, right now, we are proposing to take away from the Civil Service Commission the funds which it desperately needs in order to render this kind of a service to the Navy Department. And, incidentally, I happen to know that the Navy Department would be willing to state to any Member of the Senate that without the services of the Civil Service Commission it would not have been able to carry on its work in the navy yards in the way in which it has.

There have been times, for example, when the manpower situation has been desperate insofar as the west coast navy yards are concerned. The Civil Service Commission has been able to respond effectively to insistent demands for help and assistance, and, working with the War Manpower Commission, has been able to produce the men that were needed. Anyone conversant with the war situation knows that the pressure for persons in these yards is not going to become less. It is obviously going to become greater as time goes on.

Over a period of the past few months, the Members of the Senate have become thoroughly familiar with the fact that it is very difficult to meet the personnel needs of the Veterans' Administration, including, of course, the hospitals which are maintained and operated by this agency of Government. The primary responsibility for meeting these needs, needs which must be met if our returning veterans are to be cared for in the proper manner, rests upon the Civil Service Commission. And yet, if the Commission is not provided with the funds which it has requested and which the House of Representatives has already passed upon favorably, it will be virtually impossible for it to meet these demands.

In addition to this, the Civil Service Commission must assume the primary responsibility of making sure that government, as an employer, does what all employers should do, namely, provide job opportunities for returning veterans. And yet, just at the time when this load is beginning to mount, we propose to make a drastic reduction in the Commission's funds. If we do, and if the returning veteran is not given the help and assistance which he should receive as he seeks employment with the Federal Government, the blame will rest on our shoulders and not on the shoulders of the Civil Service Commission.

The Civil Service Commission says that it needs money to make 1,485,000 placements. For my part, I believe this is a conservative estimate. The House of Representatives, after extensive hearings before its Appropriations Committee, believes that it is a sound estimate. No testimony was presented to the Appropriations Committee indicating any basis for the Senate arriving at a different conclusion. Surely, on the record as it stands at the present time, there is no justification for our taking action deliberately designed to cripple the Federal Government's central personnel agency.

I urge, therefore, that the Senate vote to strike the amount of \$8,840,000 on page 9, line 11, and substitute for it the amount of \$10,730,000.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. On page 56 of the bill there is an appropriation for the United States Maritime Commission. That is an item in which many of us are exceedingly interested. As a member of the Appropriations Committee it has been my desire to see that this all-important Commission should have the money necessary to enable it to go forward with its work. I wish to say that there is no work in all the war effort which is more competently or more capably carried on than that of the United States Maritime Commission.

Sometime ago it was my privilege to write an article to be published in the publication known as Shipmate, entitled "Looking Ahead," with the subtitle, Navy's Peacetime Job To Be Biggest in History. It is a short article and I ask unanimous consent that it may be inserted in the RECORD at this point in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOOKING AHEAD—NAVY'S PEACETIME JOB TO BE BIGGEST IN HISTORY

(By PAT McCARRAN)

The United States Navy today is doing its biggest wartime job.

When that job is over and a grateful country says, "Well done," the Navy will face a far bigger peacetime job than ever before.

The end of this war will find the United States the biggest maritime power in the history of the world.

Entering this war, the United States had about 12,000,000 dead-weight tons of merchant shipping. The other United Nations, altogether, had about 43,000,000 tons.

Great Britain, starting with about 22,000,000 dead-weight tons of shipping when she entered the war, lost about one-third of that total during the first 2 years of hostilities, and has been unable to balance losses with new construction, at least, until very recently. Probably the maximum strength of the British merchant marine at the end of the war will be no more than 20,000,000 tons.

We have had losses, too, but new bottoms launched since Pearl Harbor from American shipyards exceed 20,000,000 tons. Our shipbuilders have done a magnificent job. Of all world powers, only the United States has more shipping today than before the war. It seems a safe guess we shall emerge from the war with about twice the dead-weight tonnage of merchant shipping Great Britain will have.

These figures are no war secrets, being based on public releases from the Office of War Information.

In taking cognizance of this situation, in outlining the facts and giving thought to their implication, we must avoid any semblance of boasting. While we are properly proud of the skill, ingenuity, and success of our shipbuilding industry, there is no question but that we should be even more pleased if circumstances had enabled the British and our other allies to do as well. We want this war won, and won as soon as possible, and it could be won faster if the United Nations had more ships. In calling attention to our country's complete ascendancy on the seven seas there is no intention to brag but only to provide essential background for some

serious thinking about the responsibilities which we as a country will face, and which our Navy will face, in the post-war world.

Holding the primary place among maritime powers, which seems assured us, we shall be confronted with many problems and with many duties, both to ourselves and to the world. A large share of the responsibility for solving those problems and for meeting those obligations will fall inevitably to the United States Navy. We must bear this fact in mind in all our post-war thinking, through all the discussions and negotiations concerning naval disarmament which we know will come.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, in reference to the amount of \$8,840,000 for this item which the committee has reported I wish to explain to the Senate that there are two appropriations here for the Civil Service Commission. Last year Congress appropriated \$6,011,000 for the ordinary work of the Commission, that is, its usual work. Last year we appropriated for salaries and expenses of the national defense part of the Commission \$13,285,362. The Commission this year asks for a like sum, but the hump of the work of the Commission has passed by. The Commission cannot use as much money as it used last year, and the very arguments made by my distinguished friend, the Senator from California [Mr. Downey], show that to be so, for he does not ask for the full amount which the House provided, but for \$2,265,000 less than the House provided. Our committee went into this matter. We had the House hearings before us. We knew that the hump had been passed.

Mr. President, the action of the committee is not to be construed as a criticism of the Civil Service Commission at all. I suppose the Commission is doing the best job it can in both its war work and regular work. We have given the Commission substantially the same amount it had last year for its regular work. I think there is a difference of \$206,000, a comparatively small difference between what the Commission had last year and what we propose to provide for the Commission this year. The Civil Service Commission cannot possibly need as much as it has asked for, and it could not use it if we provided it, because it cannot get the employees it wants. The Commission has gotten over the hump of its work for military purposes. Therefore the committee saw fit to cut down the amount to \$8,000,000 at first. However, after we had agreed on the matter in committee, the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. Burton] came forward with three or four items—I do not remember the exact number—for which he felt appropriation should be made. The committee went into the matter very carefully and, after examination, the \$840,000 the Senator from Ohio asked for was granted. So that amount is now in the bill. The very fact that the Senator from California [Mr. Downey] desires \$2,265,000 less than the House allowed shows that the House provisions ought to be changed.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Does the Senator

from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Would the Senator mind repeating the purpose of the \$340,000 which he recommends be added to the \$8,000,000? I happened to be called out of the Chamber just as the Senator was explaining that item.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will do very much better than explain the matter myself. I will refer the Senator to our distinguished colleague the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], who is now standing immediately behind the Senator from Vermont and who will explain the matter fully.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I am glad to respond to the request for an explanation of the \$840,000 proposed to be added to the committee amendment. As the subcommittee recommended originally to the general Appropriations Committee, the cut was from \$12,995,504 to \$8,000,000. I was not a member of the subcommittee, but being a member of the general Committee on Appropriations and also of the Committee on Civil Service, I made a special examination as to where that cut would fall if it were applied to that extent. In that connection I obtained from the Civil Service Commission an analysis of where the entire cut would fall. It would fall upon eight items. Of those eight items, I picked out three and a fraction of a fourth which seemed to me absolutely essential. I presented those four items to the full Committee on Appropriations, of which the distinguished acting chairman, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], had called a special meeting in order that we might be sure to cover the whole subject.

Those four items are as follows: The first is an item of \$350,000. This \$350,000, if not appropriated here, would not be available for working with the departments and agencies in order to improve what they call the utilization of personnel now on the Federal pay roll.

After presentation of the Commission's program in this field to the House Committee on Appropriations, Representative JOE STARNES, of Alabama, asked the following question in the House:

Do you not feel that that—

Referring to personnel utilization—

is probably the biggest problem that we have in dealing with the matter of personnel during the war period—the proper utilization of manpower?

The Commission concurred in that expression by the Representative from Alabama. Apparently his views were concurred in by the entire committee, in view of the fact that the total amount requested for this item was granted by the House of Representatives. The Commission's program in this field is also in line with the recommendations made by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, of which the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is chairman. The program is an attempt properly to utilize the manpower already in civil service. If the funds available for this activity are reduced by \$350,000, the effectiveness

of the Commission's work in this area will be seriously impaired.

The Appropriations Committee felt that was really an attempt to bring about greater efficiency and a measure of economy recommended by the committee headed by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. We felt that to omit that item would be short-sighted economy.

The second item is an item of \$150,000. If this \$150,000 is not appropriated it will not be available for classification of positions in Washington, D. C., and in the field. As a result of funds appropriated by the Congress, the Civil Service Commission has just begun to set classification standards for field positions in an effort to eliminate the chaos in the field, insofar as salaries are concerned, to which the House Committee on Appropriations referred in reporting the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill for 1945. I shall read a paragraph from the report of the committee. This paragraph is the convincing paragraph upon which our committee acted. The House committee points out that in the field there is chaos as between the employees of different departments. The quotation from the House committee report is as follows:

A number of the agencies appropriated for in this bill have presented requests for increases in their appropriations to cover the cost of the reclassification of certain positions in the field service. The committee is informed by representatives of these services that other agencies in the Government have classified similar positions in grades paying higher salaries and they find they are unable to keep their employees, who are naturally attracted by the offers of higher pay in other agencies for the same work. While the law governing reclassifications places the final authority for the making of such reclassifications for positions in the District of Columbia exclusively in the Civil Service Commission, it has dispersed this authority and responsibility with respect to reclassifications in the field service among the heads of the several departments and agencies. The natural result of such a law is a reasonable degree of uniformity in the matter of reclassifications in the departmental service, but a very wide variance in reclassifications in the field service. This condition promotes a very unhealthy competition among the departments for personnel, which is especially acute during periods of manpower shortage such as the present. It not only promotes confusion among the various field services, resulting from the constant transfer of employees from one service to another, but it creates a constant upward trend in salary levels in the implementation of this competition among the several departments. The committee believes the appropriate legislative committee of the House should give careful study to the unsatisfactory situation in the field service resulting from the provisions of the existing law, with a view of bringing about suitable amendment of the law to remedy this situation.

If \$150,000 is withdrawn from this work, it will mean that the Commission's activities in connection with the classification of field positions will be cut in half.

Again, the Appropriations Committee felt that to keep the field positions on the same basis as between the different departments was a constructive measure of economy.

The third item is an item of \$200,000. At least \$200,000 would no longer be available, under the proposed original cut, for the Commission's work in connection with the administration of the retirement system. I think it is perfectly clear that this item should remain in the appropriation. The proposed cut would mean, for example, that on a conservative basis at least 250,000 claims for refunds of amounts deposited in the retirement account would be awaiting action at the end of the fiscal year 1945. It also would mean that there would be delays running from 6 months to a year in the handling of these claims for refunds. In addition, there would also be delays in connection with the settling of death claims and in the placing of retired Federal employees on the annuity rolls.

The justification for those three items seemed to be clear, beyond question. The remaining \$140,000 of \$840,000 is merely for the overtime allowance of 20 percent in order to keep up with the \$700,000 thus restored to the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if this \$840,000 is added, it will provide an appropriation about \$4,000,000 less than the House allowed for the Civil Service Commission. Will the Senator explain what that \$4,000,000 is taken from? I suppose the Senator from Tennessee explained that matter while I was called out of the Chamber.

Mr. BURTON. I have the corresponding material here, if the Senator would like me to proceed with it.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know what it was.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be glad to have the Senator proceed with the explanation. I yield to him for that purpose.

Mr. BURTON. This material relates to the remaining four items which the Committee on Appropriations omitted after further consideration. It includes the one which the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is now moving to restore.

Mr. AIKEN. What are those four items?

Mr. BURTON. The first item is the one to which the Senator from California referred. It amounts to \$1,890,000. That is the amount urged by the Commission in connection with the recruiting of personnel for the war agencies. If the Senator would care to have me read a brief statement into the Record, that will explain it, although the Senator from California already has done so.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Civil Service Commission itself recruit personnel for the war agencies?

Mr. BURTON. So I understand.

Mr. AIKEN. I understand that these agencies are fairly capable at recruiting their own personnel.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I do not know who has the floor, but I ask whoever has the floor to yield to me.

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I can speak with certainty only as to the conditions on the Pacific coast, in Alaska, and in Hawaii. In those areas our war agencies throw almost entirely upon the

Civil Service Commission the burden of recruitment and replacement. The representatives of both the Army and the Navy have told me that the Civil Service Commission has done a most excellent job, and that they will feel most unhappy if these funds are cut and if the service which has been rendered by the Commission is injured.

I wish to say, Mr. President, that I have had detailed and rather exhaustive knowledge of conditions existing in the West. I believe the personnel of the Civil Service Commission have done an excellent job in replacement and recruitment work. I know they have worked long hours. I know they have insufficient staffs. So far as the West is concerned, the most critical days still lie ahead of us, we fear, because we do not think the war with Japan is yet over. We think the burden will increase.

I can say from my own personal knowledge—I say this with some humility, but yet with certainty—that the cutting of the total fund by one-third, which is what the proposed reduction amounts to, will so increase the burden on the Civil Service Commission in connection with the replacement of personnel in the war agencies, that the Commission simply will not be able to perform the work it will be called upon to do. The result will be a most serious injury to the war effort.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, does the Senator from Ohio know whether that recruiting practice is followed over the entire country?

Mr. BURTON. I understand that practice is carried on. In the report which I have here, a further statement is made with respect to it which may interest my colleague on the Civil Service Committee.

Mr. AIKEN. In connection with the proposed cut in the appropriation for that purpose, what did the committee have in mind with respect to the matter of replacements? Did the committee take the position that the various agencies would do their own recruiting?

Mr. BURTON. Perhaps the acting chairman of the committee, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar], will state what the committee had in mind. Of course, two-thirds of the fund would remain; but the fact is that the committee had in mind reducing the amount by one-third.

Mr. McKellar. Mr. President, the Civil Service Commission asked for substantially what it had last year. It is apparent to everyone that it does not have the work to do this year that it had last year. If it were to undertake to do this year the amount of work which it did last year, there would not be enough employees in the country. The Commission would have more money than it could possibly use. That is shown to a very large extent by the amendment of the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. Downey], who stated that he offered an amendment providing for \$10,730,000, which is \$2,265,000 less than the House allowed for this item. There is no charge of inefficiency or incompetency on the part of the Commission. It simply has not that much work to do.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKellar. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the committee believe that the Commission does not need the money, and would not spend it if it had it?

Mr. McKellar. I have no doubt that it would not spend it. It could not spend it if it had it. There is a very great difference of opinion as to how much is needed. It is purely for war purposes. In the appropriation for its regular and ordinary work the Commission would receive about \$6,000,000. The Civil Service Commission would receive substantially all it had last year or asked for this year.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKellar. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. Let me offer some further figures to the distinguished Senator from Vermont. In reaching the figure of \$10,730,000 which I have placed in the amendment I have offered as a substitute for both the House and Senate provisions, I have considered only the expected replacements, and no new hiring. Replacements in the United States civil-service work are now running at about 5 percent a month. To be safe, we calculated the replacements at only 4½ percent a month. Then we took the most conservative figure that could be agreed upon as to the cost of making each replacement under those conditions. That brings the total to \$10,730,000. I am told that there was no detailed information before the Appropriations Committee by which it reached its figure of \$8,840,000. The figure I am submitting, of \$10,730,000, was based upon what we conservatively believe will happen.

I should like to add while I have the floor that literally hundreds of thousands of civil-service workers have been brought into the western part of the United States, principally into Army and Navy installations. They were brought in by cooperation with civil-service agencies in the various regions throughout the United States. I know that a great many arrangements have been worked out in the New England region, for example, and in the Middle West. So I know that the Civil Service Commission is performing a valuable function.

Mr. AIKEN. Suppose this appropriation is not sufficient to do what the Senator from California feels might be required. Is there any reason why deficiency appropriations could not be made at a later date? Would it interfere with the work if the appropriation were made on the basis that if the amount were insufficient, a deficiency appropriation could be made later?

Mr. DOWNEY. As I understand, if the figure is fixed at \$8,840,000 instead of \$10,730,000, immediately about one-third of the workers who are at the present time engaging in recruitment and replacement work will have to be discharged. I am trying to speak conservatively and realistically. I think that would be a most serious injury to the war effort of the Nation. I know that would be true on the Pacific Coast.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, to comment on the matter a little further, my distinguished colleague from Vermont is a member of the Civil Service Committee, together with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar], the Senator from New York [Mr. Mead], and the Senator from California [Mr. Downey].

Mr. McKellar. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. McKellar. The committee had the benefit of all the hearings before the House committee on this subject. It had all the facts. We are all aware of the fact that the hump in civil-service employment is over. It would not be possible to obtain as many employees during the coming year as have been obtained this year. It would be impossible to get them. They do not exist.

Mr. BURTON. To complete the discussion of this particular item, I wish to emphasize to my colleagues on the Civil Service Committee that in presenting these matters to the Appropriations Committee I selected the four which seemed to be the most striking and vital of the group. This one involved a reduction of one-third of an item. If the question were sent to conference, the House would be enabled to discuss that question on its merits. Even that one-third impressed me as not being all in the same class. For example, a reduction of one-third would involve two kinds of activities. It is stated on behalf of the Civil Service Commission that its activities in connection with recruiting for Pearl Harbor and for other key navy yards, for War Department manufacturing establishments, and for the Veterans' Administration, including, of course, hospitalization facilities, would be crippled. That is the vital factor in the argument.

On the other hand, it has been stated that this would come at just the time when Congress has under consideration the enactment of veterans' preference legislation, which will place upon the Commission important responsibilities designed to protect the rights of veterans to preference for Federal jobs. The Commission states that if these proposed cuts are made it will be absolutely impossible for it to discharge its responsibilities in an expeditious manner.

The Commission is anticipating something which does not now exist. It might very well be that if legislation were enacted, and there were more preference work to be done, the Commission would have a stronger claim at that time than it has at this time.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, it is a dreary and dismal fact, but, in my opinion, the Nation is failing in its responsibility toward returning veterans. That is true in California, at least. Hospitalization, veterans' service, and veterans' reemployment are not functioning as they should. It is a sad thing that while we talk so patriotically, we cannot, by our energy and vision, measure up to our responsibilities. I know of hundreds of sad cases of veterans who have been wounded or made sick in the service of their country, who are not receiving proper attention in California. I have

no doubt that there are tens of thousands of such cases in the United States. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Ohio that this appropriation goes directly to that problem. The number of nurses and interns in veterans' hospitals, at least in California, is not sufficient to afford decent treatment. We have not been able to obtain the number of Federal employees we need there. The employees of the Commission have been working overtime. I dread to think what would happen if a reduction were made in the personnel.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, to complete the reply to the Senator from Vermont on the other three items involved, which are not presented by the Senator from California, they may be briefly summarized as follows:

One of them is \$1,000,000, which will not be available to investigate the suitability and loyalty of persons selected for key war positions.

Another is an item of \$200,000 which will not be available for use in connection with studies which the Commission constantly makes in an effort to improve its methods of doing business in connection with personnel, budget, purchasing, and other staff and administrative services.

The final item is \$500,000, which will not be available for travel in connection with investigating activities for carrying on the special recruiting programs for such establishments as Pearl Harbor, navy yards, and so forth, which are related to the other items.

I am recommending that we approve the committee recommendation of \$8,840,000, but that the rest of the matters go to conference.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, in conclusion let me say that the committee has gone very carefully into this subject, as shown by the remarks of the Senator from Ohio. We did not act capriciously in any way. When the Senator from Ohio, who is a member of the Civil Service Committee, brought before the Appropriations Committee the items which were important, and made his argument to the committee, the committee agreed to them, and we increased the amount from \$8,000,000 to \$8,840,000.

In my opinion, the committee has acted with great care. We have not disapproved what the Civil Service Commission has done. We wish to help the Commission in every way; but there is no use in appropriating for it money which admittedly it does not need. It does not need as much as the House has allowed. Therefore, I hope that the committee amendment will not be agreed to.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I wish to say a very brief word about the situation. I was absent from the city most of the time while this bill was before the committee. I was a member of the funeral committee which went to Oregon. My experience, I believe, is the experience of every other Senator. When we are away and miss something it is almost impossible, with the burdens of daily work, to go back and pick up the threads and bring ourselves up to date.

I do not pretend to know what is the precise amount which should be provided with respect to this matter. My impression was that the suggestion made by the Senator from Ohio of lifting the original Senate committee figure from \$8,000,000 to \$8,840,000 was eminently fair.

What impresses me is that if we accept the amendment now offered by the committee, and originally sponsored by the Senator from Ohio, it will give to the conference committee the very widest latitude. There is a gap there between the sum of \$8,840,000 and approximately \$13,000,000. That would present to the conference committee the fullest opportunity again to consider the matter, weigh the evidence before the House committee, and later before the Senate committee, and reach what would be a fair figure.

I have one other thought in mind. I think this is an illustration—we meet it over and over again—of the complete unwillingness of any agency of the Government to let go of a dollar which it has ever received. I do not blame the Civil Service Commission for being reluctant to take any cut. I doubt if they would be qualified for their jobs if they were not earnest and zealous in their work. However, I feel that there is a tremendous obligation resting on the Congress to cut expenses wherever it is possible. I urge that in the present instance as an additional reason why the whole matter, with wide range of authority, should be in the conference committee, and I have faith that the conference committee will do justice to all concerned. I very much hope that the amendment of the Senator from California will not be agreed to, but that the figure recommended by the committee will have the approval of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from California [Mr. Downey] to the committee amendment, as modified, on page 9, line 11.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 9, line 11, as modified.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, what is the question now before the Senate?

Mr. McKELLAR. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 9, line 11, as modified, changing the figure to \$8,840,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as modified.

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE— ENROLLED BILL

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1285) to facilitate voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces, members of the merchant marine, and others, absent from the place of their residence, and to

amend the act of September 16, 1942, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4070) making appropriations for the executive office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment of the committee was on page 9, after line 17, to insert:

No part of the appropriations herein made to the Civil Service Commission shall be available for the salaries and expenses of the Legal Examining Unit in the Examining and Personnel Utilization Division of the Commission, established pursuant to Executive Order No. 9358 of July 1, 1943.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I should like respectfully to object to the amendment. It was discussed in our committee meeting, and, although it was not reconsidered at the time we held a special meeting on this subject, I reserved the right to raise the question on the floor of the Senate for two reasons:

First, allow me to state what the substance of the amendment is. I object to it on its merits, and particularly on the ground that it should be handled through the Civil Service Committee as regular legislation, rather than as a part of an appropriation bill.

What this amendment does is to prohibit the spending of any money for the Legal Examining Unit in the Civil Service Commission; that is to say, it prohibits from now on any civil-service examinations of lawyers. It seems to me that it amounts to a matter of substance. Some lawyers employed by the Government now take civil-service examinations and some do not. The amendment would require a change in that policy; and it would seem to me that in line with the steps taken about a year ago the matter should be left to the civil-service committees and the other standing committees of Congress to make recommendations upon the subject.

A few years ago there was appointed by the President a special committee, under the chairmanship of Mr. Justice Stanley Reed, to make recommendations for civil-service improvement. That committee made a recommendation that lawyers be put under civil service.

There was a division in the committee as to the mechanics for handling such examinations. One group recommended that there be a board which would have priority over the Civil Service Commission, and another group recommended that the procedure be through the Civil Service Commission. The Appropriations Committee of the House, I believe it was, objected to acting upon an appropriation for the board of examiners until after the matter had been passed upon as a question of substantive law.

A bill was thereupon introduced in the House and passed by it to authorize the creation of a board of legal examiners. When the bill reached the Senate it was

referred to the Civil Service Committee of the Senate. It was considered at length by that committee. There was divided opinion in the committee, and a majority of its members was against a recommendation of the bill. Therefore, as the matter now stands, there is no appropriation pending to provide for the creation of a board of legal examiners, and that is as it should be.

On the other hand, there are funds available for continuing the work of the regular legal examining unit. It seems to me that the Appropriations Committee is reversing its policy when it now undertakes to pass upon the subject as a matter of law, abolish the existing procedure of examining by a legal examining unit, and prevent civil-service examinations being held without first referring that matter to the Civil Service Committees of the House and the Senate for the purpose of letting them pass upon the merits of the legislation. Therefore, I believe it would be consistent with the previous action of the Appropriations Committee not to act on any change proposed in the legal examining method until it had been first acted upon by the standing committees dealing with that particular subject. Therefore, I believe we should vote down any such action, at least in connection with the pending bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio has stated the history of this particular board. There has been a difference of opinion about it. Most lawyers, I believe, correctly feel that lawyers employed by the Government should be selected by men who are learned in the law and who know something about the legal profession.

How in the world can a civil-service agent sent to New York, or to Memphis, or to any other city in the country, determine as to the ability and qualifications of lawyers who are to work for the Government? To my mind it is idle; we are just throwing away time and money in making such investigations as that. Therefore, the Department of Justice was very much in favor of a board of legal examiners; such a board was established by Executive order and, if it had been allowed to operate under the Department of Justice, in my judgment it would have done a splendid work. I hope that the problem may be solved along that line, but the idea of the Civil Service Commission reporting on lawyers and their ability and fairness and their relative qualifications, to my mind, is something that cannot be done. Probably it ought to be left to lawyers to ascertain what kind of lawyer should be employed in the Government service.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. I recall that the matter came before the Civil Service Committee, and I may say that I agreed with the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator did and we voted together.

Mr. BURTON. I supported the board of legal examiners, but that was voted down. Now what I understand has taken place is that a board of legal examiners is, as a matter of fact, acting

in an advisory capacity to the Civil Service Commission, and the Civil Service Commission is having the benefit of that procedure, although the Commission is not now under the control of the board as it would have been under the plan originally proposed. So I believe we are getting the benefit of examination by lawyers, but, if we cut off all civil-service examination, it seems to me that we then throw the whole matter open, do away with veterans' preferences, and create a position which is not sound.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Departments of Justice, State, and Commerce and Labor appropriation bill is before the Appropriations Committee at this time, and I hope it may be worked out in the Department of Justice section of the appropriation bill in such a way that the question may be properly settled. But surely we ought not to have legal examiners, from another State ordinarily, going into a city to find out about lawyers. It is very difficult for such an examiner to pass upon the ability of lawyers. It is wrong, according to my opinion.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, when the bill establishing a board of legal examiners came before the Civil Service Committee I did not agree with the Senator from Tennessee or the Senator from Ohio on it, because I could not see why lawyers should be set aside as a privileged class, to be selected by a board of their own members, and particularly when the board had powers greater than the Civil Service Commission itself. If that is done for the lawyers, there is no reason why accountants should not say that their members in Federal employ should be selected by a special board of accountants, and why employees of the Department of Agriculture should not be selected by a board of farmers, and so on. So I opposed the entire bill, and I believe we will be very wise to oppose also this proposed amendment.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I recognize that there are arguments on both sides of this question as to how legal talent to be taken into the Government service should be secured. It seems to me, however, that that matter should be determined by the legislative committees of the respective Houses. The effect of this amendment will be to strike down the only method which we now have in existence for the selection of lawyers for employment in the Government service. I think it should be pointed out that the Civil Service Commission is now passing upon and is the screening agency through which come many of the other professional and scientific persons employed by the Government. It seems to me, especially in view of the statement made by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], that the Civil Service Commission is securing the benefit of the advice of the examining board, that we should not in the interim while this controversy is going on as to what method should be employed put a stop to the only machinery which is now in operation for the selection of legal personnel for the Government service on a merit basis.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment. [Putting the question.] By the sound the ayes seem to have it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask for a division.

Mr. EASTLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Ferguson	Pepper
Andrews	George	Radcliffe
Austin	Gillette	Revercomb
Bailey	Gurney	Robertson
Bankhead	Hatch	Russell
Barkley	Hawkes	Shipstead
Brewster	Hayden	Stewart
Bridges	Hill	Taft
Brooks	Holman	Thomas, Idaho
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Utah
Burton	Kilgore	Tobey
Bushfield	La Follette	Tunnell
Byrd	Langer	Vandenberg
Capper	McCarran	Wagner
Clark, Idaho	McClellan	Walsh, N. J.
Clark, Mo.	McFarland	Weeks
Connally	McKellar	Wheeler
Danaher	Maloney	Wherry
Davis	Mead	White
Downey	Millikin	Willis
Eastland	O'Mahoney	Wilson
Ellender	Overton	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair state the pending question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A division was called for on the committee amendment at the bottom of page 9.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, the committee amendment at the bottom of page 9, I believe, should not be adopted for two reasons: First, I believe it should be acted upon by the proper legislative committee of the Senate before it is presented to the Senate; and, second, I believe that on its merits it is not a sound provision. The substance of the provision or amendment is that—

No part of the appropriations herein made for the Civil Service Commission shall be available for the salaries and expenses of the Legal Examining Unit in the Examining and Personnel Utilization Division of the Commission.

In other words, by failure to appropriate it abolishes all civil-service examinations in the selection of lawyers for Government service.

Mr. President, this is a matter which has been under consideration by the Congress for some time. The history of it explains the situation simply, I think. In 1941 the President received a report from a special committee on civil-service improvement, headed by Mr. Justice Stanley Reed. That committee recommended that lawyers be brought under the civil-service system. There has been a controversy over the manner of examination.

In connection with the first appropriation made to carry out the plan advocated by a majority of the special committee, provision was made for a board of legal examiners, but the Appropriations Committee of the House pointed out that they would decline to appropriate further until the legislative com-

mittees of the Houses of Congress had acted upon the matter, and a bill had been passed which would authorize the creation of a board of legal examiners. Since that time the House has passed and authorized the creation of a board of legal examiners. When the bill reached the Senate, the Senate committee turned it down. Therefore at the present time the lawyers are being examined by the regular agencies of the Civil Service Commission, with the members of the board of legal examiners acting in an advisory capacity, thereby giving the Commission the benefit of their advice, but not controlling their final action.

If, however, the appropriations bill contains this provision abolishing even that form of examination, then the appropriations bill itself will abolish all examinations for lawyers. This would be contrary to the recommendations of the Reed committee, and would result in the return of lawyers to a patronage basis, making impossible the application to them of the veterans' preference provisions already in the statutes.

For years there have been some lawyers who have been chosen through civil-service examinations. They would no longer be chosen under civil-service procedure. The amendment would also eliminate the services of lawyers more recently placed under the civil service. Therefore I believe this provision should not be approved in the pending bill, because it has not yet had the approval of the legislative committee of the Senate, and I believe that on the merits it is not sound to abolish all civil-service examinations for lawyers in the Federal service.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, this provision does not interfere with the civil-service status of lawyers already in the service. It merely provides that no part of the money herein appropriated shall be used for the purpose of conducting such examinations.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield a moment?

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

Mr. BURTON. I did not mean to say it would affect those already in the civil service, but it would affect any new applications for appointments to positions in the Federal service which for years have come under civil-service examination procedure.

Mr. McKELLAR. It would affect them. The Senator will recall that there was great doubt on this question in the minds of the members of the first committee appointed. Mr. Justice Reed and some of his associates looked at the matter one way, and some the other way. The fact is that the legislative committee of the Senate did not act on the subject, did not present it to the Senate, and it has not been presented to the Senate, and we are merely going along getting lawyers for the Government selected by civil service.

To my mind, it would not have been possible to choose a way more improper than by the ordinary civil-service examiner going into a town and undertaking to ascertain anything about a lawyer, in an effort to find whether he should be in

the civil service or not. We have seen some of the results of that kind of procedure.

Furthermore, I have no doubt that if the provision proposed shall be agreed to, as it should be agreed to, the proper legislative committee will report a bill providing for a legal examining board, and that hereafter good lawyers will be secured through examination before that board.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. As I recall, when a year or two ago we passed a bill broadening the civil service, taking into the civil service nearly everyone in the Government employ, we exempted from the provisions United States district attorneys and their assistants.

Mr. McKELLAR. We did.

Mr. BARKLEY. On the theory that the best way to select a good lawyer was not to put him through the ordinary civil-service examination.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Which might not always reveal a man's capacity for dealing with the duties of a legal position.

I do not know that the lawyers chosen in the manner now provided are required to go up against the ability of the bar in the trying of cases in court, as in the case of United States attorneys and assistant attorneys, but I imagine that perhaps some of them are. I do not wish to have the legal profession assume that the appointment of lawyers is a matter of patronage.

Mr. McKELLAR. Nor do I.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think that would be most unfortunate.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think a board should be appointed in the Department of Justice.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think there should be a legal examining board somewhere to pass upon the qualifications of applicants, and pass upon them in the light of the special ability required of lawyers to do given jobs. If I can feel sure that that will be done in the regular way, whether in the pending bill or in some other measure, I shall be inclined to vote for the amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall do everything in the world possible to have a board legally established, and with the proper grade of employees, to examine lawyers, so that the very best possible attorneys may be obtained for Government work.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I shall vote for the Senator's amendment, because I do not think the Civil Service Commission is in any way competent to pass on the qualifications of lawyers. But I hope the Senator will pursue the suggestion made by the Senator from Kentucky and the suggestion he himself has just made, because I am frank to say that I am no better satisfied with Justice Frankfurter selecting all the lawyers in the Government than in having the Civil Service

Commission select them. I think there should be some board somewhere competent to pass on the qualifications of lawyers.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think so.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am not satisfied with either the Civil Service Commission or Justice Frankfurter.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator for his suggestion. Unquestionably, in my opinion, the amendment should be agreed to. I can only say to the Senate that I shall use my best endeavors to see that a legal board of examiners is established, one which can select properly qualified lawyers to provide for the Government's necessities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays. This is a substantial matter, one of importance, and I think we should have a ye-and-nay vote on it.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I may say before the vote is taken that the vote is on the committee amendment, and those who desire to sustain it, and not have lawyers examined by the Civil Service Commission, will vote "yea." I hope the amendment will prevail.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, beginning in line 18, on page 9. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DAVIS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. I do not know how he would vote on this question if he were present. I transfer my pair to the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. HAYDEN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE]. I understand that if he were present, he would vote as I intend to vote. Therefore I am at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. WAGNER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS]. I am not advised how he would vote if present and voting. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are detained in various Government departments on matters pertaining to their respective States.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is detained in a committee meeting.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] has been called from the Senate to attend an important conference. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] are absent on official business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. GORDON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are necessarily absent.

I am advised that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. GORDON] would vote "yea" if present.

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 15, as follows:

YEAS—49

Andrews	Gurney	Russell
Bailey	Hatch	Shipstead
Bankhead	Hawkes	Stewart
Barkley	Hayden	Taft
Bridges	Holman	Thomas, Idaho
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Utah
Buck	Kilgore	Tobey
Bushfield	McCarran	Tunnell
Byrd	McClellan	Walsh, N. J.
Capper	McFarland	Weeks
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Wheeler
Connally	Maloney	Wherry
Davis	Millikin	White
Eastland	O'Mahoney	Willis
Ellender	Overton	Wilson
George	Revercomb	
Gillette	Robertson	

NAYS—15

Alken	Danaher	Langer
Austin	Downey	Mead
Brewster	Ferguson	Pepper
Burton	Hill	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	La Follette	Wagner

NOT VOTING—32

Ball	Guffey	Reed
Bilbo	Jackson	Reynolds
Bone	Johnson, Calif.	Scrugham
Butler	Lucas	Smith
Caraway	Maybank	Thomas, Okla.
Chandler	Moore	Truman
Chavez	Murdoch	Tydings
Cordon	Murray	Wallgren
Gerry	Nye	Walsh, Mass.
Glass	O'Daniel	Wiley
Green	Radcliffe	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Federal Communications Commission," on page 11, line 18, before the word "maintenance", to strike out "purchase (not to exceed seven"; in line 20, after the word "expenses", to insert "not to exceed \$39,000"; and on page 12, line

2, after the word "amended", to strike out "\$2,209,000" and insert "\$2,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 18, before the word "not", to strike out "not to exceed 20 passenger-carrying automobiles."

The amendment was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. James A. O'Leary, late a Representative from the State of New York, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

The message announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2836) to grant increases in compensation to substitute employees in the Postal Service, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4073) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 1, before the word "Provided", to strike out "\$4,491,143" and insert "\$4,191,143."

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I have an amendment—

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may I inquire whether the amendment in line 2, on page 12, was agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. That amendment is involved with the amendment which the Senator from New York now proposes to offer.

Mr. MEAD. I have an amendment, Mr. President, which covers that matter.

Mr. BARKLEY. The committee amendment having been agreed to when it was reached, and it being involved in the same situation as the amendment which the Senator from New York proposes to offer on page 13, I think the vote by which the committee amendment on page 12, line 2, was agreed to should be reconsidered so the whole subject may be considered together.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I have referred to only one amendment, but I think the Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. We cannot agree to an amendment and then later agree to another amendment which nullifies our action on the first one. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the amendment on page 12, line 2, was agreed to, be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I am about to offer an amendment which I trust will be given consideration by this body, and which affects the various reductions which have been made both by the House and the Senate committee in the appropriation for the Federal Communications Commission. The amendments by which the House reduced the appropriation for this agency includes the following: \$1,000,000 from the Radio Intelligence Division; \$500,000 from the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service; \$113,607 for new positions requested; \$21,897 for the Personnel Division; \$19,353 for the Budget and Planning Division.

The Senate committee further reduced the appropriation by \$209,000, which is recommended to be taken from the regular appropriation to be applied to unspecified activities, and \$300,000 from the national defense appropriation to be applied to unspecified activities.

Altogether, the total reductions resulting from the seven Senate committee and House amendments amount to \$2,163,857.

Mr. President, at this point I send to the desk and offer an amendment on page 13, line 1. I propose that in lieu of the matter proposed the figure "\$6,146,000" be inserted, as against "\$4,191,143." I should like to have the clerk read the amendment for the benefit of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 13, line 1, in lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the committee amendment, it is proposed to insert "\$6,146,000."

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, if the amendment is adopted there should also be adopted an amendment to the committee amendment on page 12, line 2, namely, the figure "\$2,000,000" in line 2 should be stricken out, and the figure "\$2,209,000" inserted in lieu thereof.

I shall discuss the entire question now, and then shall return first to the amendment on page 12, and later to the amendment which I have offered, which encompasses practically all the amendments.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I promised to yield first to the Senator from Washington. I yield now to him. Next I will yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, before the Senator explains the purport of his amendment I should like to understand one matter clearly. I understand that the Senator from New York has indicated that the total reduction in the appropriation for this agency, both as the result of the Senate committee action and as the result of the House action, is approximately \$2,000,000. Is that correct?

Mr. MEAD. That is correct.

Mr. BONE. That figure includes the \$500,000 cut recommended by the Senate committee; does it?

Mr. MEAD. Yes; approximately.

Mr. BONE. I wish to have that point made clear, so that as we approach this matter we shall understand that the Federal Communications Commission has had \$2,000,000 cut from its budget by the action of the House and of the Senate committees.

Mr. MEAD. That is correct.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. In effect, what the Senator's amendment would do would be merely to add \$2,000,000 more to the funds which will be used by an agency which, as has been clearly shown in the Appropriations Committee hearings, is duplicating the work of other agencies, and which is opposed by the War Department, the Navy Department, and other departments which have the winning of the war under their direction. Is that not correct?

Mr. MEAD. It is not.

Mr. BRIDGES. Very well; I ask the Senator to explain why.

Mr. MEAD. That is what I was about to do when the Senator asked the privilege of the floor, in order to tell me where he stood. If I may have the patience and the attention of the Senator, I shall do my best to explain why I have offered the amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator will not convince me; I assure him of that.

Mr. MEAD. I should like to have the Senator's patience and forbearance until I explain what I have in mind.

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly, but in this matter I shall go along with the recommendations of the men who are handling our part in the war.

Mr. MEAD. That is fine. I am very glad to have that information.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. BARKLEY. Since the Senator from New Hampshire is going along with the recommendations of the War Department and the Navy Department, it might be pertinent to suggest that the President of the United States, to whom those suggestions were made, did not go along, but declined to transfer this activity from the Federal Communications Commission to them, for reasons which he stated in his letter.

Mr. MEAD. And the high-ranking military officer in charge of our Signal Corps, after an investigation of the subject, made a very commendable report on the activity of this agency.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I am very glad to yield to the distinguished acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to say that it was the opinion of the committee that there was a difference of opinion between the President and the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, and that, as a matter of fact, it was shown that this work is done by the Army and the Navy, and it was undoubtedly shown that there was duplication. We gave Mr. Fly 2 or 3 days before the committee to establish his claim, with maps, plans, specifications, and testimony. I am sure the Senator will recall that he was given every possible opportunity to submit reasons why there was no duplication. Such reasons were never presented to the committee. I do not think anyone would deny that there is duplication.

Mr. MEAD. I know that the distinguished acting chairman of our committee gave Mr. Fly unlimited time; and I am sure he would satisfy Mr. Fly a little better if he gave him less time and more money to operate the agency.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am sure of that.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. BONE. I do not wish to guide this discussion into other channels, but I was tremendously intrigued by the statement of my friend from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I hope he will come closer while I delicately suggest a little fact of Senate history to him.

My able friend from New Hampshire suggested that in this matter he wished to follow the advice of the executive heads of the defense departments, the Army and Navy. I assume that he feels that their judgment is not to be challenged, and that the infinitude of their wisdom and the plenitude of their powers are such as to induce immediate compliance on our part with their suggestions.

Let me say to my good friend that a few years ago in the Senate—and I think he was then a Member—I made bold to rise on the floor of the Senate and to defend a proposal which I had introduced in the form of a bill. At that time, when war clouds were hovering ominously over the world, and every sane person knew that there was a strong possibility of this country being incontinently plunged into war, I was deeply impressed with the belief that war was near. I then suggested to my Senate brethren that we immediately expand our arsenals and navy yards to such a degree as at least to be able to take care of the peacetime needs of the country. This would have given us a great back-log of preparedness in the way of new and vitally needed equipment and war facilities.

I proposed that we at once get rid of all the old machinery, old buildings, and old equipment, and modernize our arsenals and navy yards. I suggested, furthermore, that we lay in an enormous stock of jigs, dies, tools, and machine fixtures, and store them in warehouses, so that on a moment's notice we could tool factories and arm this country to the teeth. Men connected with the machine-tool industry came to me at that time and said that that would be manna from heaven for them. Thousands of machinists were walking the streets. They would have been more than glad to have jobs producing vital machine tools. I wanted to see the machine tools fabricated and stored in warehouses so that if we should be plunged into war, as we finally were at Pearl Harbor, we could proceed to arm the country overnight by putting those machine tools to work immediately.

I now ask the Senator from New Hampshire who he thinks opposed that proposal? Perhaps he knows.

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not know.

Mr. BONE. I am curious to know what sort of a guess he would make as to who opposed what I then thought and

now know was a very sound and patriotic proposal. I wanted my country armed.

Mr. BRIDGES. Based upon my experience in 1937, when, in conjunction with the then Senator Berry, of Tennessee, I introduced a bill to prohibit the shipment of scrap iron and steel to Japan, which was opposed by the administration and by certain appeasers in this country, I should say that probably it was the administration which opposed the Senator's proposal.

Mr. BONE. Let me digress to say to my good brother from New Hampshire that if he can find any Member of this body more eager in his efforts to stop that sort of business and more eager to suppress men who were making money out of that bloody kind of traffic than his humble friend from Washington I wish he would name him.

I have repeatedly stood on this floor and with a fervor that registered 800 in the shade denounced arming our potential enemies. I saw millions of tons of scrap steel going through the ports of the Pacific coast to arm Hirohito and give him a navy that now menaces this Republic. I saw oil and many other things going to Japan, and I denounced such traffic as a vicious thing. The same thing was true about our helping to arm Germany. But businessmen in this country were making money out of it. It was officialdom in the Army and Navy which objected to my proposal to arm this country long before the war hit us, by bigger and better arsenals and navy yards. My machine-tool proposal fell on deaf ears.

So when the Senator says to me that the Army and the Navy are opposed to something, I merely refresh his memory by some interesting sidelights on this war picture. If my advice had been followed at that time, we should have had arsenals and Navy yards with vastly increased capacities. We should have had great stocks of machine tools stored away so that we would not have run into the machine-tool bottleneck which we experienced when war hit us.

This is not an argument against the Army and Navy leaders, but it is at least a persuasive argument, in my judgment, against the impeccability of their views. I will not accept the view of any department as a finality. There is no such thing. What our businessmen sold to Hitler and Hirohito is now coming back to us in bloody "bundles for America."

I think the Federal Communications Commission has done a good job in this war. I know that it has done a good job in monitoring and chasing down the elusive shadows of dangerous ideologies and important foreign broadcasts. I do not believe we should indict the Commission's work as being something not worth while. It has made a valuable contribution to our war effort. No one knows how many boys' lives may have been saved by its efforts.

Mr. BRIDGES. Let me ask the Senator from Washington who he thinks is better qualified to say whether or not the Federal Communications Commission has been rendering good service in aid of the war effort—the War and Navy Departments, or the Senator from

Washington and the Senator from New York?

Mr. BONE. I think there is room in this pattern of war for exactly what the Federal Communications Commission has been doing, and I cannot agree with the Senator that because the War and Navy Departments object to something, that position is necessarily sound. I think our experience has demonstrated that it is not. The Senator is not accurate in saying that the War and Navy Departments are a part of this political administration. Those Departments are largely headed by West Point and Annapolis men, many of them prominent Republicans. The heads of these two Departments are also old-line Republicans.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I appreciate this contribution. I wish to take this opportunity to insert in the RECORD some information which will indicate that some of the authorities interested in the prosecution of the war, including the Commander in Chief himself, have passed on this question and have approved the position taken by the Federal Communications Commission, and have commended that agency for its splendid services and for its cooperation with the agencies of Government having to do with the war.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator say that Mr. Roosevelt, to whom he refers as Commander in Chief, is running the war, or that General Marshall, Secretary Stimson, Admiral King, and Secretary Knox are running it? Have we political domination in conducting the war, or are the military and naval chiefs conducting it?

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I do not know whether this is a collection of "\$64" questions, or whether it is merely another evidence of the impatience of my distinguished colleague. At the outset I said that I would try to answer him. I did not have an opportunity to do so. I again stated that I would take the floor, deviate from my prescribed course, and answer the Senator, when, lo and behold, I was inundated with another flood of questions. Now, if I start to answer those questions, I trust that I shall enjoy the patience of my colleagues until I shall have answered them.

Mr. BRIDGES. I wish the Senator would start with the last question, because it is fundamental. Are the Army and Navy chiefs conducting this war, or do we have political direction from the White House?

Mr. MEAD. There is evidently no political association so far as the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy is concerned. The Senator would not admit that there is any political affiliation so far as either the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy is concerned. Of course, they are above politics; but I take it from the Senator's statement that there may be some politics so far as the Commander in Chief is concerned. I am only trying to discern the inferences in the Senator's statement.

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not believe that the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and their chiefs of staff, and the various generals and admirals are playing politics. They are trying to win the war. I want Mr. Roosevelt to let them conduct the war without interference and I do not want to see him on an issue like this go over the heads of those in actual direction of the Army and Navy.

Mr. MEAD. Therefore, it is the Senator's opinion that so far as the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Knox, and the Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson, are concerned, there is absolutely no politics whatever, but that so far as the Commander in Chief is concerned there is altogether too much politics. I am very glad to have that information because it will have some effect on what I am trying to say.

Mr. President, the statement was made that there was duplication, that all this work was done by the War Department. I wish to say in connection with that suggestion that when the House cut the appropriation by \$1,000,000, on the sole basis that the Commission was engaged in military radio intelligence work which duplicated the work of the armed forces, the record did not support that position. The record indicates that the Commission is not engaged in radio intelligence of a military character. It is not engaged in a work of a military character. That is left entirely to the military. There is no duplication. Military radio intelligence is concerned with information as to the plans of the enemy and the disposition of its military forces insofar as that information can be intercepted by means of radio facilities.

In the early days of the war the inadequacy of our military preparation extended into the radio intelligence field. The Commission experts who were engaged in the job of guarding against subversive, illegal radio operations were at that time urgently requested by both the Army and the Navy to lend them a helping hand. They did so. That was not duplication. It was an invitation which was extended at that time, and the Commission responded admirably.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from New York has made the point I wanted to emphasize, namely, that the F. C. C. does not enter the field of military intelligence unless the Army or the Navy specifically requests it to enter that field in order to assist or to serve the Army or the Navy.

Mr. MEAD. That is correct.

Mr. President, as I said before, there is no duplication. There have been in times past, and there may be in the future, isolated cases of the armed services requesting the Commission to do a specific job. Only when it is requested to do so, only when it is invited to do so, will it join in the task assigned to it by the Army and the Navy. But, certainly, that does not involve duplication.

Mr. McKELLAR and Mr. TOBEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. MEAD. I yield first to the acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. McKELLAR].

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to say that if that is all this agency is going to do, the appropriation requested is a tremendous price to pay. Both the Army and the Navy have a perfect system of monitoring, radioing, and doing all this work themselves. As the Senator will remember, the Chief of Staff of the Army, General Marshall, and the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral King, entered into an agreement that they would take over the whole thing. But that agreement died. So, as a war effort, if the Chief of Naval Operations and the Chief of Staff of the Army can not be trusted to say what should go in, I do not see how anyone else could. However, for the Federal Communications Commission to set up an additional establishment for the purpose of rendering a service to the Army and the Navy, when the Army and the Navy have given the most perfect service of that kind in the world, would seem to me to be duplication. I merely wished to call the Senator's attention to those facts.

Mr. MEAD. I am very glad the distinguished acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee has called my attention to those facts; but I believe that upon review, while we should like to have it understood and universally acknowledged that the Army and the Navy have this all-inclusive service which the Senator claims, namely, this monitoring and radioing service, it will be found to be a fact that the Army and Navy must occasionally depend upon the Federal Communications Commission for the performance of certain tasks, military in character, which are assigned to the Federal Communications Commission as a result of the fact that for a long period of years, from the very beginning of the use of radio, they built up the organization. They have the experts. They are capable of performing the service required. They have sufficient manpower to do certain types of work which the military is not equipped to do.

Another point is that it is the Federal Communications Commission, not the military, which does the monitoring of broadcasts coming from enemy countries. It is the United States Federal Communications Commission which does the policing of the United States radio network. If there is any subversiveness by means of the radio, if there is an agent representing any foreign country, either in the United States or in any of its Territories, who uses the radio, it is the Federal Communications Commission which runs him down and brings him to justice. So the Federal Communications Commission has a monitoring service. The Federal Communications Commission has its own radio espionage service. The Federal Communications Commission has its all-embracing radio police service, while the military has a distinctly military service which has to do with the movement of troops, and the military actions of the enemy nations. So there is no duplication.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. I thank the Senator. Is the Senator from New York familiar with a letter to the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Knox, written by Admiral Leahy on February 1, 1943, and later concurred in by the Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson, and which was later endorsed by a letter to the President of the United States, signed by Secretary Stimson and Secretary Knox?

Mr. MEAD. Yes; I have a copy of both those letters, and I have a copy of the President's reply to them.

Mr. TOBEY. I also have a copy of the reply.

Mr. MEAD. Yes.

Mr. TOBEY. I am trying to reconcile the various statements which the Senator has made. Of course, I know that we accept at par all that he says, but we are all apt to err. In the letter sent to the President of the United States by the Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson, and the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Knox, reviewing the situation from a military standpoint, and citing the powers which the F. C. C. is now exercising, they came to the conclusion that those powers should be transferred to the Army and the Navy for better prosecution of the war. I quote one paragraph of the letter:

In view of the foregoing it is concluded that the better prosecution of the war will be served by terminating all military and quasi-military radio intelligence activities of the Federal Communications Commission and confining such activities to the Army and Navy.

Is the Senator familiar with that quotation? There is a definite statement that the better prosecution of the war will be served by the transfer of these facilities from the F. C. C. to the Army and Navy. That letter went out on February 4 to the President of the United States. For many months it went unanswered. It was written on February 4, but it was September 7 before an answer was received from the White House—7 months. The answer that came back to the Army and Navy from the Commander in Chief turned down the request which had been made and stated:

Your suggestion has been given careful study by the staff of the Executive offices. After full consideration I have determined that the transfer should not be made.

I shall not read the remainder of the letter.

So we have hanging in the balance like the sword of Damocles for a period of 7 months a great important issue which existed in the Army and Navy. In all that time no reply was made to the letter by the President and then he said he had made up his mind on the advice of the White House staff. Who does the Senator think composed the White House staff which turned down the request of the Army and Navy? I should like to have his professional opinion upon it.

Mr. MEAD. Is that the end of the question?

Mr. TOBEY. No; it is only series 1.

Mr. MEAD. I see.

Mr. TOBEY. The worst is yet to come.

Mr. MEAD. If I have an opportunity to answer the question, let me say that it is my understanding that the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy wrote the letter to the President without a personal investigation, so far as they were concerned, into the subject matter contained in the letter. They in turn wrote the letter for someone who brought the matter to their attention. The President of the United States, the Commander in Chief, however, discussed the matter with every agency of the Government involved and with the members of the military that are attached to the White House. He also discussed it with other military officers. In his widespread consideration, he referred it from one agency to another, and when the matter was thoroughly considered he brought it to the attention of the Secretaries in the letter which he wrote. If the Senator will let me read from the President's letter it will be only fair, in view of the fact that I let the Senator read in my time from other letters.

Mr. TOBEY. I shall be very glad to have the Senator do that, but may I interpolate a question?

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I desire to read from the President's letter.

Mr. TOBEY. Did that conference with the President take in the distinguished military genius, Harry Hopkins?

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I want to be very courteous, and I will ask my distinguished colleague to allow me to conclude my answer.

Mr. TOBEY. I acknowledge my error.

Mr. MEAD. With that in mind, I want to read from the President's letter just as the Senator read from letters directed to the President. This is a letter directed by the President to the Secretaries. I quote from the President's letter:

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This is in response to your letter of February 8, 1943, signed by you and Secretary Stimson—

This letter is addressed to Secretary Knox—

proposing an Executive order transferring the radio intelligence functions of the Federal Communications Commission to the War and Navy Departments. Your suggestion has been given careful study by the staff of the Executive offices. After full consideration I have determined that the transfer should not be made.

The work of the Radio Intelligence Division of the Commission was founded upon the long existing radio-monitoring functions carried on by the Commission as a part of its essential peacetime work. The need for the expansion of these functions was brought to my attention prior to our entry into the war and I approved the general set-up.

So this was the second time the President went into it.

Quoting the President's letter further:

Expansion has been made to meet the wartime needs of the Commission itself and of other agencies of the Government.

Continuing the President's letter, I read:

The Radio Intelligence Division serves important wartime needs of several of the civilian Government agencies in the radio intelligence field, including the State Department, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Office of Censorship, the Bureau of Eco-

nomie Warfare, the Weather Bureau, the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, and others. In addition—

The President goes on to say—

I understand that the Commission stands ready to perform for the Army and Navy such services as are expressly requested by them. The Commission and its Chairman have expressed to me their desire to cooperate with the Army and Navy in every possible way.

I quote further from the President's letter:

It is my desire that matters of the kind presented by the present proposal be dealt with at the outset by conferences between the interested agencies. If differences should occur, the matter should be reviewed by the Board of War Communications, which is the responsible interdepartmental body I have charged with the responsibility in the field of wartime communications.

So the President concludes by setting up a system whereby all these matters of interest to so many departments can be thoroughly discussed and ironed out.

Now I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. In response to the Senator's last statement that the President was setting up this agency to adjudicate these matters, let me point out to the Senator that that is a matter of tweedledee and tweedledum. The F. C. C. is practically a one-man Commission. James Lawrence Fly dominates the Board. I know that to be a fact. The Board to which the Senator referred, the Board of War Communications to which to make appeals, is also dominated by James Lawrence Fly. So Mr. Fly acts in both capacities.

Now coming back to the statement of the Senator from New York—and I know he will realize that there is nothing personal in what I now say—he brings in a statement that attempts to justify the President turning down Secretary Knox's and Secretary Stimson's request that these powers be returned to them, and he says to the Senate, in effect, that Secretary Knox and Secretary Stimson acted merely in a pro forma way, that some dummy in some office, some subordinate, put a letter before them which they signed without knowing the contents of the letter, and sent it to the President. That is what the Senator implied, did he not?

Mr. MEAD. I wish the Senator would withdraw that word. I said that the Secretaries did not make a personal investigation of the matter. I pointed out that the President went to great lengths in making a study of the matter. The President reviewed it twice. I infer that the Secretaries personally did not review it. I left the thought that the officers under them took the matter up and brought the letter to the attention of the Secretaries.

Mr. TOBEY. There are in Washington what are known as "dummies," and I have found them and so has the Senator from New York. I will, however, if the Senator wishes, substitute the word "subordinate."

The Senator, to me, seemed to imply that the letter was signed without their knowing the substance of it. Is that correct?

Mr. MEAD. I would not go that far. Mr. TOBEY. How far?

Mr. MEAD. I said they sent a letter to the President and the letter was prepared for their signature by some very fine men associated with them in the Army and Navy.

Mr. TOBEY. They read the letter before they signed it, did they not?

Mr. MEAD. I would not infer that they did anything they ought not to do.

Mr. TOBEY. Let me read from the text of the letter which they wrote and to which they signed their names.

In view of the foregoing it is concluded that the better prosecution of the war will be served by terminating all military and quasi-military radio intelligence activities of the Federal Communications Commission and confining such activities to the Army and Navy.

There is a very definite statement, asking for the transfer, and after putting that in writing on February 4, some 7 months elapsed before they got an answer and the letter embodying the request of the Army and Navy, who are charged with prosecuting the war, was nullified. That is the net result.

Mr. MEAD. The chances are, if we went into it thoroughly, we would find that a very deep study was made, and we would also ascertain that, in view of the fact that a half dozen if not a dozen Federal agencies utilized these facilities, the use of this service is more effectively and efficiently carried out by the plan outlined in the President's letter after an exhaustive study was made, and is the best plan. That is my judgment. It may not be the judgment of my colleague, but, if it is not, I am sorry and I shall be glad to have his views.

Mr. TOBEY. I am sure the Senator will agree with me on one thing, namely, that the text shows, and the record shows, that February 4 a letter was written to the President by the Secretary of the Navy, concurred in by the Secretary of War, and the answer came back under date of September 8. Does not the Senator agree to that?

Mr. MEAD. Yes; if the Senator will agree with me that during the intervening time there was a clear knowledge of the fact that the matter was being studied, there was conference after conference, a system was set up, and everybody knew the system was there, and, above all, the service was working, and working efficiently and effectively.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator from New Hampshire has referred to Mr. Fly as dominating the F. C. C. I think the Senator will agree with me, however, that Mr. Fly is one of the ablest and most intelligent men in the public service today. He has had an extremely difficult job to perform, as every one who has had anything to do with the Federal Communications Commission ever since its beginning in the city of Washington knows.

I have served upon the Committee on Interstate Commerce of the Senate for about 20 years, and have been chairman for 10 years or so, and I know something

of the work that a man who is Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, or a member of the Commission, has to do. While I have not always agreed with Mr. Fly, indeed, I have violently disagreed with him at times, in my opinion he has been one of the most maligned men in public service in Washington during the last few years.

Mr. Fly has had one of the most difficult jobs to perform in this city. When it comes to regulating radio, and radio communications, and to dealing with those engaged in the industry, with all the selfishness displayed by them, one must recognize what an extremely difficult job the Chairman of the Commission has.

In regard to the particular matter now under discussion, my understanding is that it not only deals with the war effort, but the Commission furnishes information for various other departments in Washington. Is that correct?

Mr. MEAD. That is correct.

Mr. WHEELER. That was my understanding. Whether or not this particular service to the Army and the Navy has been most efficient, nevertheless, an organization has been set up, which possibly has been too large, but certainly there could not be any excuse for cutting it to the extent to which it has been cut in the appropriations, both in the Senate and in the House committees.

Mr. HILL and Mr. BRIDGES addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. MEAD. I yield to the Senator from Alabama for a question.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Montana has had the most intimate insight into the work of Mr. Fly and the Communications Commission. He is now engaged in hearings, I understand, which have been proceeding for some time, covering the work of Mr. Fly and the Communications Commission. There is no man who can speak with more authority about Mr. Fly and his work than the Senator from Montana, the chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

It seems to me the important feature is that the Joint Chiefs of Staff recommended that the activities and facilities under discussion be transferred to the Army and the Navy, but they did not recommend that the work be discontinued. Because their recommendation to transfer the work to the Army and the Navy was not adopted certainly does not mean that the work should be discontinued or that the Congress should now refuse to appropriate the funds with which to carry on the work. I think both the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as well as the Federal Communications Commission, recognize that the work must be done. The Commission is now doing that work, and the Commander in Chief and the Commission have asked Congress to provide the money with which to do this necessary war work.

Mr. BRIDGES. Will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. MEAD. In a moment I shall yield.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce,

which committee has more to do with the Federal Communications Commission than any other committee of the Senate, with the exception of the Committee on Appropriations, made the statement that this agency probably aids a number of other agencies, and I wish to give him a correct answer as to the number of agencies it actually serves.

It can be seen that there is ample reason for the President's set-up when there are agencies which are both military in character and civilian in character which require the services of this one agency.

The Radio Intelligence Service serves important wartime needs of several of the civilian Government agencies in the radio intelligence field, including the State Department, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Office of Censorship, the Bureau of Economic Warfare, the Weather Bureau, the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, and other agencies. So there is ample evidence that there is reason for the set-up set forth in the President's letter. I desired to answer the Senator's question more fully by telling him of those agencies.

Mr. President, I wish to emphasize what my distinguished colleague from Alabama has said, and to add that the statement of the Senator from Montana relative to the Chairman of this Commission squares with my estimate of him. I think Mr. Fly is endeavoring to do a patriotic job, that he is deeply concerned with the well-being of the people of America, and is attempting to administer the affairs of his agency as capably as is possible. I am pleased to have this opinion coming from one who is so closely associated with the work of Mr. Fly and the Commission as is the distinguished Senator from Montana.

Now I am glad to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, does not the Senator think we are getting down to a rather fundamental issue, namely, who is running the war; whether the President in a political way is running it or whether the Army and the Navy are running it; whether the President is going to superimpose on the Army and Navy his will insofar as the Federal Communications Commission is concerned? Is not that a fundamental question?

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I do not suppose the Senator and I could ever get together on the question of the President's ability to handle not only the big war job he is called upon to administer but any other job. I have an idea, from what the Senator has said in the course of the debate, that he has a firm and fixed opinion. I am merely trying to point out that I believe the efficiency of the Federal Communications Commission and of other agencies will be better served if the appropriation that was approved by the Bureau of the Budget shall be restored. If that has anything to do with the President and his political affiliations, I do not recognize it, even though my distinguished colleague may.

Mr. BRIDGES. In other words, the Senator wishes to go on record as putting the President's say-so as to the Fed-

eral Communications Commission and their war intelligence work ahead of the opinion of the Combined Chiefs of Staff, ahead of the War Department, ahead of the Navy Department. In other words, he superimposes the political on the military in the conduct of the war. Is not that the fundamental issue here?

Mr. MEAD. That is not my position, and that is not the fundamental issue. If my colleague will wait until I complete the record, I believe I shall be able to produce a great deal of evidence which will indicate that high military authorities have time and again commended the Federal Communications Commission, so much so that we can all rely upon it to do a great job in the field where it has been developing experienced and expert personnel since the early twenties.

Mr. President, I have here a letter from Earle F. Cook, lieutenant colonel, Signal Corps. This was for the chief signal officer, is dated April 6, 1943, and reads:

SECURITY OF CIPHERS

SECRETARY, JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF,
Washington, D. C.

Through: Commander G. B. Myers

1. In compliance with J. C. S. 138/3 dated December 1, 1942, subject: "Security of ciphers" and in accordance with the allocation of Government agencies made to the Army and Navy security sections respectively, the following summary of findings at the Federal Communications Commission is submitted:

- (a) Cryptographic security—excellent.
- (b) Physical security (cryptographic systems)—excellent.
- (c) Documentary and information security—excellent.
- (d) Qualification of personnel—excellent.
- (e) Cooperation was given fully and willingly.

2. In view of the above, it is considered that no concern need be felt over communications originating or passed in the Federal Communications Commission organization at this time.

3. The established contact between Signal Security Service and the Federal Communications Commission will be continued.

For the Chief Signal Officer.

EARLE F. COOK,
Lieutenant Colonel, Signal Corps.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. No, Mr. President; I must read another letter or two for the benefit of my distinguished colleague.

Mr. BRIDGES. Why does not the Senator tell the Senate who Mr. Cook is?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator tell us what the word "cryptographic" means, the word used in the letter which the Senator just read? My distinguished colleague the Senator from New Hampshire and I do not understand what the meaning of that word is.

Mr. MEAD. While we are busy with the debate—

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator want me to find out what the meaning of the word is and tell the Senator?

Mr. MEAD. I do not.

Mr. LANGER. I will look it up and tell the Senator what it means if he wants me to.

Mr. MEAD. It pertains to the deciphering of codes.

In reply to the request of the Senator from New Hampshire, let me say that Mr. Cook is a lieutenant colonel in the Signal Corps. He addressed the letter for the chief signal officer.

Mr. President, the second letter comes from William J. Donovan. That letter is addressed to the Honorable KENNETH MCKELLAR, chairman of the Appropriations Committee. William J. Donovan, by the way, is a high military authority, and one very closely associated with work of this character. He wrote:

We understand from a letter dated 18 February 1944, addressed to this office by the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, that your committee is interested in learning of the manner in which the F. B. I. S. wire service is utilized by subscribers.

This Office is a subscriber to the Service. We receive daily, by ticker, transcripts of foreign broadcasts as recorded by the Service. These transcripts, which, of course, include those emanating from enemy and enemy-occupied countries, are used by us in two ways: First, they reveal the particular propaganda line being followed by the nation in question at any time. Second, they often reveal, unintentionally at times, bits of information which can be put together by our experts with facts derived from other sources to give us valuable political and economic intelligence concerning the enemy. We then turn such knowledge to our own purposes in carrying on the duties assigned to us by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

I hope that this explanation of the manner in which O. S. S. uses the facilities of F. B. I. S. will be of assistance to the committee in its deliberations.

That is testimony that there is close cooperation and close harmony between the military and the Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I must read another letter from a high military authority so that we will be sure that it is not the President alone on one side and the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War on the other side; that it is a question as to how this organization can best serve the best interests of all the agencies of government interested in the services they are able to furnish.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I shall yield as soon as I finish this letter, because it is in part an answer to one of the Senator's former questions.

Mr. President, this letter comes from the headquarters of the Seventh Air Force, the office of the Air Force commander. The subject of this letter is assistance rendered by Federal Communications Commission in locating lost airplanes. It is one of a large number of letters I have from military leaders, and it goes on to explain the very close teamwork that exists, the harmony that exists, and the effectiveness that is always evidenced whenever they are called upon to do a job.

Mr. President, when I finish reading this letter and several others I shall be very glad to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will not the Senator explain—

Mr. MEAD. I shall yield, Mr. President, as soon as I finish this letter:

1. In the past months numerous calls have been made upon the Federal Communications Commission radio facilities to obtain bearings and fixes upon lost airplanes. These bearings and fixes have proven accurate and most helpful. In one particular instance on March 5, 1943, the assistance rendered by the Federal Communications Commission resulted in the prompt locating and rescuing of the crew of a bomber forced to land at sea. On another occasion, March 19, 1943, bearings received from the Federal Communications Commission assisted in locating a plane which was in imminent danger of being forced to land at sea. Largely as a result of these bearings this forced landing was averted.

2. Other instances too numerous to mention have occurred in which the assistance given by the Federal Communications Commission has been of inestimable value. The facilities of Federal Communications Commission have been, and still are, absolutely necessary to the successful operation of the Army's lost-plane procedure in the Hawaiian area.

3. I wish to commend the Federal Communications Commission and its men responsible for this assistance. It has been of great value and in numerous cases directly responsible for the saving of lives and valuable equipment.

WM. J. FLOOD,
Brigadier General, United States Army,
Chief of Staff.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield now?

Mr. MEAD. I will have to read several other letters.

Mr. BRIDGES. I should like to ask the Senator one simple question.

Mr. MEAD. The Senator has asked me a number of questions, and I wish to read several letters in reply.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, there is a question I wish to ask the Senator which has a bearing on these letters.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, these letters have a bearing on a previous question asked of me by the Senator from New Hampshire, and I feel that I am inadequately answering the Senator's question unless I read one other letter. I will ask the Senator to be patient with me for a moment, and then I shall yield.

This letter is addressed to S. W. Norman, Acting Chief, N. D. O. Section, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D. C. I believe this letter will bring to mind the quick, ready response and the very happy cooperation which exists between all these services.

This letter is in the nature of a blanket acknowledgment—

Think of that, Mr. President, a blanket acknowledgment.

This letter is in the nature of a blanket acknowledgment of the usefulness which your intercepts have been to Army radio security. A considerable number of intercepts which you have forwarded have indicated careless, superfluous or actually obscene transmissions made by Army radio stations. I wish to advise that each and every one of these cases, wherein it has been possible to trace the transmission to an Army station, has been thoroughly investigated and definite action taken to prevent recurrence. The results of these actions are already evident in the

diminishing number of reports of improper operation.

Sincerely yours,

W. T. GUEST,
Lieutenant Colonel, Signal Corps.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield now?

Mr. MEAD. Before I read another letter, Mr. President, I will now yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I should like to have the Senator tell us exactly what proportion of the time of Mr. Fly and the Federal Communications Commission has been spent in the campaign or crusade to obtain these endorsements from minor Army officers all over the country? Why does not the Senator read a letter from Admiral Leahy? We all know his name. He is assistant to the President of the United States on military and naval matters. Why does not the Senator read the letter which Admiral Leahy wrote in 1943 to the Federal Communications Commission about how they were interfering with the war effort? Why does not the Senator read letters from General Marshall and Admiral King? Why read letters from lieutenant colonels and other minor officials who have been solicited to write letters?

Mr. MEAD. May I make the suggestion that the Senator from New Hampshire read them into the record in his own time?

Mr. BRIDGES. Very well. Will the Senator now answer the first part of my question, which is, How much time has the Commission spent in conducting the campaign to secure these endorsements?

Mr. MEAD. The Senator from New Hampshire probably wants the information detailed by days, weeks, minutes, and all other details?

Mr. BRIDGES. No.

Mr. MEAD. I have no way of tracing the activities of the Federal Communications Commission or any other commission with reference to matters of that kind. I have many other letters here, letters which come from men high in governmental affairs. I have some very valuable endorsements. It was not my intention at the beginning of my remarks to read them, but, in attempting to answer the question, I read those letters. I do not know whether it took any time to obtain them. I do not know whether they were spontaneous. But if there are any further letters on that side of the subject, or any letters on the other side of the subject, I think my distinguished colleague should read them if he cares to have them in the RECORD.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. As everyone knows, the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] is a member of the Appropriations Committee and a very valuable one. I have the greatest respect for his views. However, I wish to call his attention to several things which he may have overlooked.

The first is that our committee has tried as hard as it was humanly possible to do, to meet every requirement for this war. We have appropriated every sum that the testimony has shown to be necessary. The Senator will recall that for this very year we appropriated \$28,000,000,000 more than the War Department has used, and the War Department is going to return it. The officials of the War Department are honest, and on July 1 they are going to return that money to the general fund of the Treasury. I commend them for their action.

As the Senator knows, our committee, the Senate, and the Congress wish to give the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps every opportunity in the world to win this war as quickly as possible. But when the Army officers and the Navy officers tell us they believe they are doing a work which an independent, nonmilitary agency is also doing, and when they say the performance of the work by the nonmilitary agency is unnecessary, it seems to me we should follow what is said by the highest officers we have, with the exception, of course, of the President, who is the Commander in Chief—and he is doing a fine job as President of the United States. However, the Chief of Staff of the Army and the Chief of Naval Operations have said that this activity by the Federal Communications Commission is virtually a duplication of what they are doing; and they have ample money with which to do their work. They have ample material. They have every material under heaven. They are obtaining and are giving out all the radio news. They tell us that their system is virtually perfect. I believe that system is today the most perfect system in the world. I really believe that the American radio system is the most perfect radio system in the world.

When we have those assurances from such high authorities, it seems to me that before we appropriate more than \$2,000,000 for a nonmilitary agency to maintain a duplicate system, we should be very careful.

The Senator will recall that in the committee we gave the representatives of the Federal Communications Commission every opportunity in the world to present their case. They did so in the most elaborate fashion. By the way, Mr. President, their presentation was most interesting to me. The hearing was one of the most educational ones I have ever attended. It taught me more about radio than I ever knew before, and I was very happy about it.

Nevertheless, after all was said and done, the evidence was that the work done by the Federal Communications Commission's system was a duplication of the work done by our Army and Navy. For that reason, I wish to say that I hope no Member of the Senate and no one in the country will think that any member of the Appropriations Committee is not in favor of doing everything in the world and furnishing every dollar in the world that is necessary to help the operations of our Army, Navy, and Marine Corps in this great war.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I desire again to state that there is no duplication, and that if this appropriation is not increased there will be a diminution of the service. The War Department and our military agencies maintain a service which has to do with the movement of enemy troops and matters of that nature. The service rendered by the Federal Communications Commission is a different one. It is a monitoring service. It is a service which ferrets out sabotage and espionage in this country and in territories belonging to this country. It is a service operating under a system which is already set up. If we take away \$1,000,000 from the appropriation for that service, \$1,000,000 worth of such work will not be done. It does not make any difference how much money we appropriate for the Army; that will have no effect on this work. We shall either have to have this work done by means of making appropriations for it or it will not be done.

There is no duplication. It is a distinct work done by the Federal Communications Commission under a system which is already set up, a system which is serving half a dozen agencies of the Government.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator is charging, then—

Mr. MEAD. Oh, Mr. President, the Senator should not say—

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the Senator should wait just a minute. He has yielded to me, and I had not finished my statement.

Mr. MEAD. But, Mr. President, I am not charging the Senator or anyone else.

Mr. BRIDGES. Oh, yes; the Senator is. The Senator has charged that the War Department and the Navy Department would close their eyes and would not carry on a very necessary war effort if the money referred to is not appropriated.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, without any argument, I deny that statement.

Mr. BRIDGES. Is not that what the Senator said?

Mr. MEAD. I deny that I said it.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator said that if the increased appropriation is not provided the service will not be performed. If it is necessary to the war effort, I say it will be performed, and the Army and the Navy will perform it.

Mr. MEAD. The Army and the Navy will do it if we authorize them to do it, and if we give them the money with which to do it, and if the system already set up is altered in such a way that they can do it. But when an agency is already set up to handle the work, at the instance of the President of the United States, we cannot expect the work to be done if we withdraw the appropriations with which that agency is to engage in that particular kind of work. Certainly the War Department will go on with its military activities, but the Federal Communications Commission will not go on with the services they are charged with

the responsibility of rendering if we take away the necessary appropriations.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is it not true that the Federal Communications Commission now has many facilities, both mobile and stationary, through which it is engaged in the detection of spies and others who are attempting to convey information to the enemy, and that it is also engaged in many other activities which either would become ineffective or would have to be transferred to the War Department or the Navy Department, which would have to set up for themselves systems for performing such work?

Mr. MEAD. That is undoubtedly true. For instance, Mr. President, no other agency monitors foreign broadcasts. That is done by the Federal Communications Commission. The Commission is constantly listening to broadcasts emanating from enemy countries. That is its responsibility. If it needs a certain amount of money in order to do that work, and if we refuse to appropriate that money, it simply will not be able to do the work.

Mr. BARKLEY. There are hundreds or perhaps thousands of such broadcasts occurring each day, all over the world, and the Federal Communications Commission is listening to them and in that connection is interpreting broadcasts spoken in almost every language used in the world, and thus is obtaining information which may be invaluable to our Army and Navy and our other armed services.

Mr. MEAD. In order to show the situation more clearly, let me say that the Foreign Broadcast Service of the Federal Communications Commission is a war agency, and is the only agency of the Government charged with the responsibility of listening to and reporting on what foreign government propaganda lines are. Certainly, if we take away the appropriations for the Commission, it cannot do that work. The Federal Communications Commission has the sole responsibility of providing American war and diplomatic agencies with the monitored results in such form and at such places as those users desire. Without proper appropriations, much of this work will come to a standstill. No other governmental department or agency is either equipped or trained to take over this work. A thorough check reveals not an iota of duplication of effort in the Government in this work.

The important question then arises, Who is to do this highly valuable work for the various governmental departments, such, for example, as the Foreign Economic Administration? I quote Mr. Leo Crowley:

Because the F. E. A. uses this essential service, I want to register our concern for its continuation.

The State Department wants the coverage extended. How can that be done if we curtail the appropriation?

The commanding general in Hawaii has the material of this agency flown to him daily in bombers leaving San Francisco, and that is at his instance.

The letter of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, which is answered by the President, and the security survey of the Chief Signal Officer on behalf of the Joint Chiefs, had no mention to make of this phase of the communications activity.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I urge the restoration of ample funds for this work, for the sake of those governmental agencies, military and civilian, which require and utilize this vital service.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I have looked through the hearings before the Appropriations Committee. If there is any statement or evidence in those hearings that the work which the Federal Communications Commission is doing is a duplication of work being done by other agencies—the Army, Navy, or any other agency—I should like to know where the statement or evidence is. I fail to find in the hearings any evidence that there is any duplication.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, there is no duplication.

Mr. HILL. Not only is there no duplication, but I can find nothing in the hearings, either in the form of a statement or testimony of any kind, that even tends to show that there is duplication.

Mr. MEAD. The War Department has a similar service, and I want it continued. I would vote to increase its appropriation, because I value this kind of work. The Federal Communications Commission has a system which is not duplicating the military system, and unless we restore these appropriations we shall curtail its services which are so valuable to the military and civilian agencies of the Government.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. I have understood from what the Senator has said that this Commission is doing certain war work. Was there any testimony before the committee which would justify the abandonment of this war effort which is being performed by the Commission?

Mr. MEAD. It is my opinion that there was not sufficient evidence that this agency ought to be eliminated from the field or curtailed, as is proposed by the House Appropriations Committee.

Mr. TUNNELL. As I have understood the Senator, the Commission is doing certain war work which no other agency is doing or is authorized to do.

Mr. MEAD. That is correct; and in doing so, in my opinion, it is not duplicating any existing work.

Mr. TUNNELL. Then why, in the Senator's opinion, is it proposed to eliminate this work? Is it because the Appropriations Committee has determined that the war effort is too great, and that a part of it should be curtailed? What is the purpose?

Mr. MEAD. There is an honest difference of opinion existing among the members of the committee. I am convinced that it would be a serious mistake, and that it might imperil the war effort, if we were to reduce the effectiveness of this agency. I think it is rendering a very valuable service on the psychological

warfare front and otherwise, in running down spies, in discerning the activities in foreign countries, in conducting a monitoring service, in preventing the loss of planes in rescuing the crews of other planes. It is doing a remarkable job in a number of instances, and I hope it will be continued.

Mr. TUNNELL. Curtailing these appropriations would result in the curtailment of certain war efforts, would it not?

Mr. MEAD. That is correct.

I should like to add to the Record the names of some of those who have written recommending a continuance of this service.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. The question was asked a while ago as to how much time Mr. Fly consumed in obtaining these letters. Let me say to the Senator that I happen to know that Mr. Fly was attacked before one of the committees of the other House, and certain statements were made. I assume that when those statements were made he possibly asked persons who were familiar with the work he was doing to write letters. It will be recalled that he was not permitted to testify before the House committee in answer to the charges. I assume—and I think it is true—that he did ask certain persons in various executive departments who had been using the service to say what they thought about it, and these letters were in response to that request.

Mr. MEAD. I should have added at the time that perhaps in some cases the agencies were requested by Members of the House or by members of the Senate Appropriations Committee to communicate their views in the matter.

Mr. WHEELER. Some of these things may be duplications; some of this work may possibly be duplication; but there is a great deal of it which is not duplication. Can we divide it and say what part is duplication and what is not, when we are monitoring radio messages from all over the world? The War Department may be doing some of the same monitoring, but certainly it does not do all the same work that this Commission does. The fact that one branch of the Government is doing some of the same work is no reason why we should eliminate the appropriation, because the Federal Communications Commission could not do the work it is doing without duplicating some of the work that is done by the Army. In other words, its work is broader.

Mr. MEAD. Yes.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not know whether it needs this particular amount of money; but I do not want to take the responsibility, at a time like this, for arbitrarily reducing the appropriation by cutting off one and a half million or two million dollars in the midst of war. Even though it were proved that there was duplication, it could not do any harm to have two separate agencies tracking down spies and determining what stations were operating in this country in violation of the law, or performing the many other duties which

this Commission and the War Department are trying to perform.

Mr. MEAD. The more information we have on that aspect of the war, the better it will be for the successful prosecution and early termination of the war.

Mr. President, in a moment I shall be through for the present. I have read letters from the President of the United States; the commander in chief of the Army; from Brig. Gen. William J. Donovan; from the colonel acting for the chief signal officer; from Brig. Gen. William J. Flood, of the Office of Chief of Staff; from Lt. Col. W. T. Guest, of the Signal Corps; and from Lt. Col. Earle P. Cook, of the Signal Corps, for the chief signal officer.

I have a number of other communications, the signatures to which I wish to read into the Record. They include communications from those who have written letters complimentary of the work of the Federal Communications Commission. They include communications from Elmer Davis, Director, Office of War Information; Adolf A. Berle, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State; Leo T. Crowley, Administrator, Foreign Economic Administration; Carlos P. Romulo, colonel of Infantry; Francis A. Jamieson, Assistant Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs; T. L. Tsui, First Secretary of the Chinese Embassy; Jack Winocour, Director of British Information Services; a communication from L. W. Knoke, vice president of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, addressed to Robert D. Leigh, Director of the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service; a communication from David L. Glickman, Acting Chief, Australia, New Zealand, and Afghanistan Section of the Foreign Economic Administration, who addressed a letter to the Chief of the Foreign Broadcast Analysis Division; also, a letter from William L. Langer, Director, Branch of Research and Analysis of the Office of Strategic Services. These are all commendatory letters.

I have a letter from S. N. Moore, captain, United States Navy, Administrative Office, Office of Naval Intelligence; one from Harold R. Shaw, lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States, district postal censor; also, a letter from Lt. Gen. Robert C. Richardson, Jr., the commanding military officer in Hawaii. He commends the service very highly.

I have also a letter from Maj. Gen. George V. Strong, Military Intelligence Division of the War Department.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. HILL. General Strong is chief of all the intelligence services of the Army.

Mr. MEAD. That is correct. I wanted to read these letters because they are from lieutenant generals and major generals, from heads of departments, and from others concerned directly with the question. Here is one from Harley A. Notter, Chief, Division of Political Studies of the Department of State. Here is one from H. R. Stark, United States Fleet, United States naval forces in Europe. He is not a minor naval officer.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I shall yield in a moment.

Here is one from Robert C. Richardson, Jr., lieutenant general. That is considerable rank above a colonel. He is a lieutenant general of the United States Army, commanding the central Pacific area. At his insistence this service is flown to Hawaii every day by bomber.

Mr. President, before finishing I wanted to put those letters in the Record, and to say that some of them were written at the request of the Federal Communications Commission, and others perhaps at the request of interested Members of this body. However, they are all highly commendatory. They are from a number of agencies of Government, and from military officials of high rank.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I knew that my distinguished colleague, when he said I was quoting minor officers, would want me to quote from the statements of any other officers, and put them in the Record. As I have said, he probably will have an opportunity to do so when his turn comes.

I now yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. Did the Senator put into the Record any volunteered letters?

Mr. MEAD. I have no way of determining the interest of anyone who wrote. The letters are here. They were presented to our committee. I did not question any of the writers. I do not believe they were bludgeoned into writing and I presume they were writing of their own free will. I assume that when a major general, or the head of a great public agency, with a reputation for integrity behind him, writes a letter to a committee of the Congress he expects the committee to give the letter consideration, and I am sure he would not send it if the writing of it had been forced upon him as a result of expediency.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. Certainly everyone who is acquainted with General Strong, who is the head of the Intelligence Department of the Army, knows that he could not be bludgeoned into writing a letter for anyone.

Mr. MEAD. The Senator is correct. I would be impugning the motives of the writers of the letters to question them, and I do not wish to do so.

Mr. WHEELER. We all know that General Strong is one of the ablest and best men in the service.

Mr. MEAD. I would not even raise the issue. I take the letters at their face value because, as the Senator has said, these men have very responsible positions. The writer of this particular letter has a reputation for honesty and integrity which goes back to the day of his birth.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. If a request is sent to a certain subordinate official in the Army or Navy, or any of the governmental services, and that officer knows that his Commander in Chief, the President of the United States, feels strongly in the matter, does not the Senator believe that he would rather hesitate to refuse to write an endorsement?

Mr. MEAD. I know that a man of profound integrity would not.

Mr. BRIDGES. Very well. I will tell the Senator that certain individuals have written letters and made statements, and have had to take a position in public which they privately did not feel.

Mr. MEAD. There is no doubt about that. That may happen sometimes.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator knows it has happened many times.

Mr. MEAD. I have no knowledge of it insofar as this record is concerned.

Mr. President, I understand that we are not to have a vote on this question tonight. If that be true, I am willing to yield the floor.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I understand there are other speeches to be made on this subject. I do not wish to take the Senator from the floor, but am willing to allow him to retain the floor when we recess over until Monday, which I understand to be the program. However, I should like to have him yield long enough for me to read a couple of telegrams into the Record dealing with an entirely different subject.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Delaware.

Mr. TUNNELL. I wish to ask the Senator if he has any reason to suspect that any of the letters which he has read were not written in good faith.

Mr. MEAD. I know most of the men who wrote them. They would not write a letter that was not in good faith. These letters, in my judgment, are letters which can be relied upon. The information contained in them can be substantiated. They are letters which were given to a congressional committee as a substantial contribution to the work of the committee.

Mr. TUNNELL. And, so far as the Senator knows, there is no reason for anyone charging that any force was applied in having the letters written?

Mr. MEAD. I should be surprised if there were a scintilla of evidence that these men would yield to force of any kind.

Mr. TUNNELL. Then the Senator believes that the letters, whether written at the request of someone else or at the volition of the writers, represent the ideas of the men who wrote them so far as the Senator knows.

Mr. MEAD. That is correct.

Under the circumstances I am now very glad to yield to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] with the understanding that I shall have the floor again when this subject comes up.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator. Mr. President, I expected that we would complete consideration of this bill to-

day. I thought certainly we would reach the item known as the T. V. A. provision of the bill, but we have not reached it, and we are a long way from it.

I have before me a telegram from a constituent newspaper, together with my reply, which I wish to read, because I should like to have the truth known to the Senate and to the country.

Mr. President, I received the following telegram from Bill Hagan, city editor of the Chattanooga News-Free Press, concerning the T. V. A. The telegram was addressed to my secretary, and reads as follows:

CHATTANOOGA, TENN., March 14, 1944.

DON McKELLAR,

Care Senator K. D. McKellar:

We think Senator McKELLAR's viewpoints on some of the questions arising from the T. V. A. amendments would be interesting to our readers and their publication would give the Senator fair expression of his views. It is charged here by T. V. A. supporters that the amendments would cripple T. V. A., hurt its contribution to the war effort, and would be injurious to Chattanooga by moving personnel and offices to Muscle Shoals area. We invite Senator McKELLAR's full expression on these and any other pertinent matters including his purpose in sponsoring this legislation. Please wire collect soonest.

BILL HAGAN,

City Editor, Chattanooga
News-Free Press.

That is signed by Mr. Hagan.

Mr. President, that was a very proper inquiry, I thought, and I wired immediately to the Chattanooga News-Free Press, as follows:

Your telegram this date received. I shall be happy to give you my viewpoint on the Tennessee Valley Authority amendments. The statements made by Lillenthal or others that these amendments would cripple or destroy the Tennessee Valley Authority or hurt its contribution to the war effort or hurt it in any other way are wholly without foundation in fact. These amendments are all intended and will help to make a more honest, a more economical, a more effective, and a less political organization out of the Tennessee Valley Authority. They will simply require honesty and integrity in administering the greatest governmental institution that ever came to Tennessee.

I stop the reading long enough to say that one of these directors continually charges that I am opposed to the T. V. A. Let me say to my colleagues that in my own judgment I built the T. V. A. of Tennessee. I was instrumental in getting all the appropriations; and it takes money to build such plants. For that reason I do not think I can be successfully charged with being opposed to it when the contrary is the truth. That by way of parentheses.

I have devoted the best years of my life and the best abilities of which I am capable to the building of the Tennessee Valley Authority. I was fighting vigorously for the Tennessee River dams when Lillenthal was a boy in school.

My distinguished colleague, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] sitting by me, asks in an aside whether he was in short pants. [Laughter.] I do not know whether he was in short pants, but he was a boy in school when I was here on this floor fighting, against the most

tremendous odds, to get an appropriation to start the Wilson Dam at Muscle Shoals.

I am just as strong for it as I ever was. I got most of these dams built, notably the Chickamauga in which Chattanooga is so much interested, the Hiwassee and Guntersville Dams nearby which were built over the joint personal and lobbying opposition here in Washington of both Lillenthal and Arthur Morgan.

I digress here to say that I had to notify them to get out of town or that I would denounce them on the floor of the Senate for lobbying. I had a man at the depot that afternoon at 4 o'clock, and they were there and took the train at 4 o'clock.

At that time they were obsessed with the idea that T. V. A. was not to go into competition with private power companies, but should just produce enough power to be used as a yardstick to show the private companies what they must charge for current.

These two directors fought for the yardstick idea for years, and were opposed to the building of any other dams except the first three dams that were erected.

They went to the homes of the members of the Senate Appropriations Committee—

I do not believe any of the present members of the committee were on the committee at that time, among the members then being Senator Byrnes and Senator Adams, of Colorado.

They went to the homes of the members of the Senate Appropriations Committee to lobby against the building of any other dams except the Wilson, Wheeler, and Norris. These three were enough for their yardstick, so they said.

So they said.

They did not recommend the building of these other dams.

They never have recommended the building of any other dams, except one, which was known as the Douglas Dam.

The President did not recommend the building of these other dams. The House of Representatives did not recommend the building of these other dams. These additional dams with one exception, the Douglas Dam—

As I said before—

were all built by amendments offered by me and gotten through both Houses of Congress despite the fiercest fights by Arthur Morgan and David Lillenthal against those dams. Lillenthal is not an engineer; he is a lawyer by profession, or he was educated as a lawyer.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Did he ever practice law?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know, but his biography says he was educated as a lawyer. The telegram continues:

I do not know that he ever practiced. Now, as to injuring Chattanooga, by moving the principal offices to the Muscle Shoals area, I beg to say that the original act provided that the principal offices should be at Muscle Shoals. Without getting Congress to change the act Lillenthal of his own motion and contrary to the law moved the principal offices to Knoxville and Chattanooga. In the committee I offered an amendment to authorize these principal offices to remain at Knoxville. My good friend Senator BANKHEAD—

One of the finest men I ever knew, the colleague of the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]—

My good friend Senator BANKHEAD, who took and is taking the Lillenthal side of this question, offered a substitute requiring that the offices be moved back to Alabama, and that substitute passed.

The substitute prevailed in the committee.

I am going to offer a bill to provide by law for keeping the offices at Knoxville. They should be kept there. But the committee turned me down on that, and decided in favor of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

The only reason it could have possibly passed the committee was because Lillenthal had illegally moved the offices in the first place. If he had had any respect for the Congress, he would have had it done legally. I intend to offer an amendment to make the head office at Knoxville, and, of course, other offices where they are necessary. It developed in the recent hearings before our committee that Lillenthal had reported—

And I hope Senators will listen to this, that Lillenthal had reported in his report to the Congress last July—

that he had paid \$13,148,000 into the Treasury of the United States. Lillenthal was obliged to admit that this was a falsehood. It also developed at the hearings that he was selling current at a cheaper rate to the Aluminum Co. of America than he was to the Reynolds Metal Co., which was also an aluminum company. When asked directly if that were true, he directed his assistant, Mr. Wessenaur, to answer the question.

As the record will show.

Mr. Wessenaur answered that he was selling at a lower price to the Aluminum Co. of America—

That should be "to the Metal Co. than to the Aluminum Co."

and thereupon Lillenthal was confronted with a letter that he had written to Mr. McIntyre of the White House stating that he was selling two-tenths of a cent less to the Aluminum Co. than he was to the Reynolds Metal Co., and tried to explain it on other grounds. This two-tenths of a cent differential against the Metal Co. in the 20-year contract amounts to \$7,000,000. That Lillenthal is engaged in political matters is perfectly apparent from the testimony in the hearings which I am sending you a copy of under separate cover together with the bill and reports. He was hotly engaged against me in 1940 and no doubt he will be similarly engaged in 1946 if he is still with the Authority.

And I ought to have added "and if I were living at that time."

I continue to read:

Dr. A. E. Morgan and Senator Norris have both charged him with being a deceitful falsifier and I have reluctantly reached the same conclusion about him.

Mr. President, I now wish to quote what those two gentlemen said about him. My telegram continues:

Dr. Morgan said: "There is a practice of evasion, intrigue, and sharp strategy, with remarkable skill in alibi and the habit of avoiding direct responsibility, which makes Machiavelli seem open and candid. The marble claims, in my opinion, were an effort at deliberate, bare-faced steal."

That word is spelled s-t-e-a-l. I am quoting the very words of Dr. Morgan.

They are not mine. I now quote from former Senator Norris. We all remember Senator Norris, a fine Senator and a fine gentleman. But things have occurred this morning which, when I looked at the newspapers, made me sit up and take notice. I saw there a statement that he sided with Lillenthal in this matter. But I wish to read what Senator Norris said at the time. He said:

"People generally have an idea that when these marble claimants and Mr. Lillenthal and the other Morgan"—

Meaning Dr. H. A. Morgan, of course, who was a member of the Authority—

"were about to rob the Government of millions of dollars, Dr. Morgan"—

Meaning Dr. Arthur Morgan—

"stepped in and called a halt and saved the day."

Mr. President, that is not my statement respecting Lillenthal. Former Senator Norris called his name. Let me read that again.

"People generally have an idea that when these marble claimants and Mr. Lillenthal and the other Morgan were about to rob the Government of millions of dollars, Dr. Morgan stepped in and called a halt and saved the day."

My telegram continues:

So far as I know these statements of Morgan and Norris have never been answered by Lillenthal.

I have hunted to find out if Lillenthal had ever answered the statement.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; I yield.

Mr. HILL. Since the Senator has quoted former Senator Norris, I think I ought to call attention to the fact that I received a telegram this morning from Senator Norris, without any suggestion or solicitation in any way, shape, or fashion on my part. The telegram is as follows:

McCook, NEBR.

Hon. LISTER HILL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

I have absolute faith in the integrity, honesty, and ability of Lillenthal. He has been a faithful, honest public servant.

G. W. NORRIS.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am quoting what Senator Norris said at the time of the so-called steal.

Mr. HILL. This telegram is under date of March 15, and reached me this morning.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, yes; of course.

Mr. HILL. As I said, I did not solicit it in any way whatever. It was sent to me, and I think in justice to Lillenthal it ought to be read at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. McKELLAR. I know the Senator from Alabama did not solicit it. But do not all of us know that it was solicited just the same by someone else?

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall yield in a moment. Everyone knows that what

Dr. Morgan said applies at this point. He said:

There is a practice of evasion, intrigue, and sharp strategy.

The telegram which the Senator just read—sharp strategy? Sharp strategy?

Dr. Morgan continues:

With remarkable skill in alibi and the habit of avoiding direct responsibility.

He does not deny it himself, but he asks his friends to deny it for him.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator from Tennessee a few moments ago paid tribute to Dr. Morgan, formerly chairman of the board of T. V. A., and pointed out that Dr. Morgan, as I understood his language, "saved the day" by showing up the effort of Lillenthal and somebody else to steal millions of dollars. Is that correct?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; I was merely quoting Senator Norris.

Mr. TOBEY. Yes. And in the quotation the Senator brought that truth out, did he not?

Mr. McKELLAR. That statement came out, yes.

Mr. TOBEY. Exactly. I now point out to the Senator that so far as virtue being its own reward is concerned, in this instance it does not apply, because shortly thereafter Dr. Morgan was thrown out on his ear, in spite of the fine, heroic work he had done; is that not correct?

Mr. McKELLAR. He was thrown out.

Mr. TOBEY. Where did he land?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know where Dr. Morgan is.

Mr. TOBEY. I leave that.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know where Dr. Morgan is, but the man he described here, and that my good friend Senator Norris described here, landed in Morgan's place and is supposed to be taking his place.

Mr. TOBEY. And Dr. Morgan, who saved the day, who showed this thing up, goes out, and the other man stays in; is that correct?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. That is one of the happenings.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. It ought to be stated that Dr. Morgan's separation from the position as chairman of the T. V. A. and as a member of the T. V. A. Board had many ramifications wholly independent of and disconnected altogether from this episode to which the Senator from Tennessee refers. We all understand what happened at that time.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not. I was not consulted, and do not know what happened at that time. I had built the dams. Of course I had very little to do with it. After the House refused to appropriate any money, when the matter came before our Appropriations Committee, my good friends on that committee were more generous to me than I ever deserved in all my life.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I agree that the members of the committee were generous with the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator for agreeing with me. They were more generous to me than I ever deserved, and at my earnest request they granted the money to me to build those dams, and I feel I am under an obligation to see that that money, and that all money which we appropriate for that activity, shall be honestly administered, and with the greatest integrity and care.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I merely desire to say that I withdraw myself from any encomium the Senator from New Hampshire is paying Dr. Arthur E. Morgan. I was opposed to his confirmation in the first place, and held it up here for 2 weeks until the former Senator from Nebraska, Mr. Norris, and the Senator from Tennessee talked me into withdrawing my opposition and letting him be confirmed. I did not think he was fit to be on the board in the first place. I still do not think he was. My views had nothing to do with any activity of his as a member of the T. V. A. They had to do with some general flood-control views he had announced from the grandstand before he was ever appointed on the T. V. A. But it seems to me that the important element in this matter is as to whether or not, in connection with the quotation which the Senator from Tennessee has just read from my dear friend, former Senator Norris, the two gentlemen that he mentions there, to wit, Mr. Lillenthal and Dr. H. A. Morgan, still constitute a majority of the T. V. A.

Mr. McKELLAR. They do constitute a majority of the T. V. A.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. In other words, Senator Norris, in the quotation the Senator has read, accused Mr. Lillenthal and Dr. H. A. Morgan of what is known in my section of the country as skulduggery—not necessarily criminal offense, but just general skulduggery.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, sir; that is it. I continue to read from the telegram:

It is estimated that the House appropriated in unexpended balances and in receipts \$87,791,000.

That is in this last appropriation.

And of this sum \$8,600,000 was to be a reserve. The committee thought that this reserve should be eliminated and it was. They cut down other small items amounting in the aggregate to \$2,000,000 and left \$77,981,000 appropriated to the Tennessee Valley Authority for the ensuing year. In other words, all this propaganda that Lillenthal is sending out, 99 percent of which is false, arises over the cutting of his appropriations of about \$2,000,000 out of a total of \$79,000,000, and yet he is falsely stating to the people of the valley that the reduced appropriation and his manner of getting it from the Congress will cripple or hamstring the Tennessee Valley Authority. The United States Government has got nearly a billion dollars invested in the Tennessee Valley Authority which is managed dishonestly, imprudently, and, as Dr. Morgan says, "with evasion, intrigue, and sharp strategy."

The Congress of the United States has been marvelously generous to me in giving me the appropriations to build these magnificent dams on the Tennessee River and I want to say with the utmost sincerity that as long as I am a Senator in this body those funds are going to be used honestly and openly for the benefit of the people, rather than to turn them over to this man Lillenthal to be run into waste that certain of his associates have denounced as dishonest and corrupt. He has made the Tennessee Valley Authority a member of the private power trust, against which Senator Norris and I fought so long. Lillenthal today is lobbying by sending out falsehoods all over the State—

I am not so sure but some of these come directly or indirectly to Senators, a fact concerning which I wish to pay my respects on Monday.

Lillenthal today is lobbying by sending out falsehoods all over the State, using the Government's money for the purpose of circulating this propaganda trying to save himself from an ignoble end which he knows is facing him. Surely no one in Tennessee believes that at my age I am trying to obtain patronage.

That is the only answer they had, that because Senator McKellar has added the \$4,500 provision to the bill, which applies to Tennessee Valley and to all other activities of Government and departments of Government, he is trying to obtain patronage.

Good heavens! What would I do with patronage, at my time of life? What in the name of God could I do with it? They must think I am simple-minded, to charge me with trying to get patronage, at my time of life.

The telegram concludes, as follows:

Lillenthal's statement to that effect is a willful, deliberate, and malicious falsehood. I thank you very much for your request for the facts.

Mr. President, I have taken the time to read those two telegrams because they have given the facts concerning what we have done. The original Tennessee Valley Authority Act provided that the Tennessee Valley authorities should pay their receipts into the Treasury of the United States, just as every other governmental agency of the United States is required to pay its receipts. By some marvelous means, Lillenthal got the House to insert a provision that he need not pay those receipts into the Treasury, but that he could simply take the receipts and run that great, almost billion-dollar plant as he is doing—a plant which is bringing in \$65,000,000 or \$70,000,000 a year. I know the Senator from New York will excuse me for taking his time at this late hour in the afternoon. I would have waited until tomorrow to make the opening remarks of the statement I expect to make; but I understand that the majority leader and minority leader believe the Senate should take a recess until Monday. For that reason I felt that this much of my statement should go into today's RECORD, so that Senators could have it. I know that Senators are being communicated with by Lillenthal's ally, associate, and great friend, a man by the name of Silliman Evans, who is running the Nashville Tennessean. I suppose most Senators have read the vicious and outrageous

falsehoods he has written in editorials. I am sure he has done me a great service by sending those editorials to Members of the Senate, because I am confident no Member of the Senate will believe I am the kind of man he has charged me with being. At any rate, I hope Senators will not believe his charges; because, as God is my judge, Mr. President, I have but one desire in this matter, and that is to do what I honestly and sincerely believe to be right. I do not believe that Government money, amounting to almost a billion dollars invested in that great institution in Tennessee, should be turned over to Lillenthal, for him to use as he sees fit, without regard to another living soul.

AUTHORIZATION FOR FINANCE COMMITTEE TO FILE REPORT DURING RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to file during the recess of the Senate its report on Senate bill 1767.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. If the bill is to be reported during the recess, can the Senator give any information as to when consideration of the bill will be begun?

Mr. BARKLEY. It had been the purpose to commence consideration of the bill on Monday, if we were able to conclude consideration of the pending bill today. However, I imagine the consideration of Senate bill 1767 will follow consideration of the pending bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Kentucky? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McKellar. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. McKellar. I understand that the Senator desires that the Senate take a recess until Monday. Is that correct?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. McKellar. The Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] very graciously gave me the privilege of making an interpolation in the RECORD this afternoon. I hope it will be understood that the Senate will take a recess, not an adjournment, until Monday, so that the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] will have the floor on Monday.

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, yes; that will be the course.

Mr. McKellar. Very well.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Avra M. Warren, of Maryland, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Dominican Republic, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Panama;

Leland B. Morris, of Pennsylvania, now Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Iceland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Iran;

Orme Wilson, of New York, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1 assigned to the Department of State, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Haiti;

Willard L. Beaulac, of Rhode Island, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, now serving as counselor of embassy at Madrid, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Paraguay;

Ellis O. Briggs, of Maine, a Foreign Service officer of class 2, now serving as counselor of embassy at Habana, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Dominican Republic;

Louis G. Dreyfus, Jr., of California, now Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Iran, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Iceland;

Gen. Thomas Holcomb, of Delaware, United States Marine Corps, retired, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the Union of South Africa;

Kenneth S. Patton, of Virginia, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1 and consul general at Calcutta, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to New Zealand; and

Rudolph E. Schoenfeld, of the District of Columbia, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to act as Chargé d'Affaires near the Government of Luxemburg now established in London.

By Mr. McKellar, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:
Sundry postmasters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James Harold Doolittle to be lieutenant general in the Army of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hoyt Sanford Vandenberg to be major general in the Army of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

That completes the Calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE JAMES A. O'LEARY

The Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The resolution (H. Res. 474) was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
March 16, 1944.

Resolved, That he House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. JAMES A. O'LEARY, a Representative from the State of New York.

Resolved, That a committee of six Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, in connection with the announcement of the death of Hon. JAMES A. O'LEARY, late a Representative from the State of New York, I send to the desk a resolution, which I ask to have read, and for which I ask present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 272) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Senate Resolution 272

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. JAMES A. O'LEARY, late a Representative from the State of New York.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Under the second resolving clause the Vice President appointed Mr. WAGNER and Mr. MEAD as the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, March 20, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 16 (legislative day of February 7), 1944.

THE JUDICIARY

Claude P. Stephens, of Kentucky, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Kentucky, vice John T. Metcalf, resigned.

TERRITORY OF ALASKA

Ernest Gruening, of New York, to be Governor of the Territory of Alaska. (Reappointment.)

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be colonel with rank from February 9, 1944

Lt. Col. Hubert Reilly Harmon, Air Corps (temporary major general).

To be colonel with rank from March 1, 1944

Lt. Col. Benjamin Greeley Ferris, Infantry (temporary brigadier general).

Lt. Col. Charles Samuel Ritchel, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Thomas Guerdon Hearn, Infantry (temporary major general).

Lt. Col. Donald Henley, Infantry.

Lt. Col. Joseph Daly Coughlan, Chemical Warfare Service (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Reese Maughan Howell, Field Artillery (temporary brigadier general).

Lt. Col. Henry Jervis Friese Miller, Air Corps (temporary major general), subject to examination required by law.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be colonel

Lt. Col. William Donaldson Fleming, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from April 6, 1944.

Lt. Col. Samuel Demetrius Avery, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from April 9, 1944.

Lt. Col. Francis Joseph Clune, Medical Corps, with rank from April 10, 1944.

Lt. Col. George Edward Lindow, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from April 16, 1944.

Lt. Col. Jaime Julian Figueras, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from April 20, 1944.

DENTAL CORPS

To be colonel

Lt. Col. William Elder Sankey, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from April 17, 1944.

To be lieutenant colonel

Maj. James Harvey Pence, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from April 1, 1944.

To be captain

First Lt. S. Kingdon Avery, Dental Corps (temporary captain), with rank from April 19, 1944.

VETERINARY CORPS

To be colonel

Lt. Col. Herbert Kelly Moore, Veterinary Corps, with rank from April 1, 1944.

CHAPLAINS

To be colonel

Chaplain (Lt. Col.) Harry Dubois Southard, United States Army (temporary colonel), with rank from April 4, 1944.

To be captain

Chaplain (First Lt.) John Henry Hingson, United States Army (temporary captain), with rank from April 15, 1944.

IN THE NAVY

Capt. Thomas L. Sprague, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 16th day of April 1943.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 16 (legislative day of February 7), 1944:

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE LIEUTENANT GENERAL

James Harold Doolittle

TO BE MAJOR GENERAL

Hoyt Sanford Vandenberg

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 16, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we praise Him who hath granted unto us exceeding great and precious promises that through them we might become sharers in the divine inheritance; to these let us add strong faith, self-control, endurance, and godliness. Inspire us to hallow our gifts, time, and influence. Thou, Lord of the temple, reveal Thyself in light, in grace, and in all goodness, full of blessings.

Impress us, blessed Master, that the measure of our labor and diligence is the measure of our success. Every earnest endeavor to serve God and man and every temptation mastered is added strength in that chamber where a man meets himself. As legislators, chosen by a free people, our responsibilities are outstanding and tremendous; we pray that they may be marked by loftiness of purpose and distinguished by the moral law and not by the rigor and rudeness of selfishness. Heavenly Father, let our sense of truth and honor be on the very highest plane, as a lamp shining in a dark place until the day dawns and the morning star rises in our hearts. Grant that the glorious realities of patriotic citizenship may dominate and be reflected in every group throughout our broad land. Unto our Saviour be glory both now and to the day of eternity. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation:

FEBRUARY 29, 1944.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Sincerely yours,

EMORY H. PRICE.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is agreed to.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from committee:

MARCH 15, 1944.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I herewith tender my resignation from the following committees: The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and the Committee on Accounts.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN D. McWILLIAMS.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 470), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That EMORY H. PRICE, of the State of Florida, and WILLIAM A. ROWAN, of the State of Illinois, be, and they are hereby, elected members of the Standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Naval Affairs.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 471), which I send to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That JOHN D. MCWILLIAMS, of Connecticut, is hereby elected to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The resolution was agreed to.

LABOR'S PERFORMANCE IN PRODUCING IMPLEMENTS OF WAR

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter I have received from Mr. Donald Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. Ludlow addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HOCH and Mr. MILLER of Nebraska were granted permission to extend their own remarks in the record.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and any other special orders heretofore granted, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SOUND FINANCIAL CONDITION OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. I assume that most every Member in this Chamber reads David Lawrence, the columnist. I wish to read into the RECORD an article by him, as it is commendable to Congress. It appears in the Washington Star of March 6 and reads as follows:

CONGRESS DOES A GOOD JOB—ANALYSIS SHOWS FINANCES OF THE UNITED STATES SOUNDER THAN ANY COUNTRY IN THE WORLD

When American people do a good job they should be commended for it. When Congress does a good job it should be commended too, and the facts are that the finances of the Government of the United States are in better shape than those of any other government in the world, and better still, than they have been since the outbreak of the war. The story should be broadcast as widely as possible.

XC—169

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

SIMPLIFIED INCOME-TAX RETURN

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I notice present on the floor the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON], ranking member on the minority side. There is a great deal in the newspapers about simplification of tax returns. I understand the Treasury Department has extended the time until April 15 for the filing of tentative returns on 1944 income. In the event this Congress fails to simplify the returns before that date, I believe there will be further reaction against the Congress for having led the people to believe that a simplification would be forthcoming, and then the returns have to be filed under the same old rules.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. The Ways and Means Committee is working on simplification now, and we hope to have the basic points agreed upon this week, so that we will be ready to report a bill to the House within the next few weeks.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is what I am interested in, so that we will get it passed before April 15.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include therein a newspaper article quoting Dr. Ruthven, president of the University of Michigan, regarding the effort of Federal agencies to build political power through the public schools.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article on the Polish question, which appears in a magazine printed in England, entitled "The Nineteenth Century and After," by Mr. F. A. Voigt, its editor. I have taken this matter up with the Public Printer, who advises me it exceeds the amount allowed under the regulations, and that the total cost will be \$195. Notwithstanding, I ask unanimous consent that it may be included in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding, and without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

JEWISH HOMELAND IN PALESTINE

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GAVIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HCRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include certain extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short radio address delivered by a young man at the Malvern Preparatory School on the soldiers' vote bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks.)

JEWISH HOMELAND IN PALESTINE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his remarks on the subject of the Wright-Compton resolution.

Unfortunately my views on the Wright-Compton resolution have been misinterpreted. Ofttimes in the heat of debate gratuitous remarks are injected, which, uncorrelated with definite aims heretofore expressed, may give erroneous impressions. I am and ever have been for the establishment of a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine.

As to the pending resolution, I shall oppose any amendment that militates against the establishment of such a commonwealth.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an article by Mr. Walter Lippmann appearing in the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CEILING PRICE ON STRAWBERRIES

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. FULBRIGHT addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF PRICE CONTROL ACT

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I recently spent a few days in my district and I returned to Washington with a clear impression that the people almost unanimously favor an extension of the Price Control Act. I am glad to learn that the chairman of the Banking Committee [Mr. SPENCE] has introduced a bill to provide for such extension. I also wish to endorse in its entirety the statement issued during my absence by three of my colleagues on that committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DILWEG], and the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. SULLIVAN], urging prompt and full hearings on the bill.

I join them in urging that the administration of the act be fully considered so that the agency may meet its real purpose of preventing runaway prices and at the same time avoid needless and oppressive hardships upon our people. In my opinion the public will be greatly interested in these hearings and will fully approve efforts to correct legislative and administrative weaknesses in this program.

WASHINGTON, N. C., FIRST TOWN NAMED AFTER WASHINGTON

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. BONNER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and include therein an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein a short speech by me.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE PUBLIC DEBT

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my own remarks, and to include therein a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I received a letter from a very conscientious constituent of mine which reads in part, as follows:

I guess it is foolish of me in my declining years to be so concerned about our freedom

and future. But I wish more people were more sensitive to our real position in the world. Our Nation now bankrupt and the planners and spenders still looking for ways to spend. When the final day of reckoning comes the children will begin to cry and those responsible will be gone and the generation responsible for having the Belshazzar feast today will bemoan their fate.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Houston Chronicle on the subject of lend-lease aid to Russia.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article from the Christian Science Monitor on lend-lease.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

STABILIZATION OF INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, to revise and extend my own remarks, and to include therein a short article from the Washington Star of March 15.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. DEWEY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD by printing therein an editorial written by former Governor Cox, of Ohio.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THANKS AND APPRECIATION

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity of expressing my sincere gratitude to the many colleagues of mine in the Congress who communicated with my office and with me during my recent illness. It is a source of much gratification to have your friends interested in you when you are sick. I am certainly happy, however, to be back with you and to be again associated with such fine colleagues.

STABILIZATION OF INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY] expressed apprehen-

sion and alarm over an alleged agreement that has been entered into between the United States and several of the larger United Nations pertaining to post-war finance. As I recall, the Speaker appointed a special committee some months ago to which the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, and myself were appointed. The able gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] was named chairman. That committee was to keep track of post-war planning, which I presumed would embrace post-war financing abroad. To my knowledge that committee has never held a meeting. It would be shocking indeed for this administration to enter into fast and binding agreements with other countries without at least doing the Congress the courtesy of advising in advance what it is proposed to do.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

STABILIZATION OF INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I sympathize very much with what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] have just said. Under our present rules of congressional procedure, and especially under the constitutional requirement of a two-thirds vote of the Senate for ratification of treaties, we must expect the Executive more and more to act in international matters without consulting the Congress. It occurs to me that all these committees investigating post-war collaboration will become absolutely futile unless and until the constitutional provision requiring a two-thirds vote in the Senate to ratify treaties is changed.

This Congress in effect has no voice now whatsoever concerning international dealings and more and more in the future will be inept and impotent in these matters. The constitutional provision as to a two-thirds vote in the Senate is an obstacle to congressional expression, it handicaps this country in the administration of international affairs.

Let us remove this stump upon which our international affairs will continue to be wrecked and change that provision to a simple majority of the House and Senate in the matter of treaty ratification.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein letters from two constituents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT]?

There was no objection.

STABILIZATION OF INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, regarding the proposals of the administration for so-called post-war monetary collaboration, I wish to announce that I have just completed a second study of the Keynes-Morgenthau scheme which I expect to present to the House next Wednesday, March 22.

Members will recall that I gave to this body the first study dealing with this subject November 1, 1943, under the title "British Plot to Seize Control of United States Gold."

The paper which I shall present to you next Wednesday will clearly demonstrate that the alleged capital formation of the Keynes-Morgenthau scheme is a fraud.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a telegram and a statement and to print the same in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. HOFFMAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

INCREASE IN COMPENSATION TO SUBSTITUTE EMPLOYEES IN THE POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 2836) to grant increases in compensation to substitute employees in the Postal Service, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the full conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BURCH]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is this bill?

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, it is a bill that we have had in conference and the conferees have reached a unanimous agreement. The bill was passed by the House and provided that after a substitute had served as much as 5 years or more he could be made, should a vacancy occur, a regular of the fifth class.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Do the minority members of the committee know this is going to be called up at this time?

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BURCH]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2836) to grant increases in compensation to substitute employees in the Postal Service, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered (2) and (3).

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered (1).

And agree to the same.

T. G. BURCH,
B. FRANK WHELCHER,
D. J. WARD,
FRED A. HARTLEY, Jr.,
N. M. MASON,

Managers on the part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
WILLIAM LANGER,
C. D. BUCK,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2836) to grant increases in compensation to substitute employees in the Postal Service, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 1: This amendment limits credit for adjustments of the increases in the rates of pay of substitute employees in the Postal Service to 3 years of past continuous service and the hourly rate of compensation is adjusted accordingly.

Amendment No. 2: This amendment requires 3 years of continuous active service to qualify for allowable service; whereas, under the original bill 1 year of continuous active service is sufficient.

Amendment No. 3: This amendment provides that allowable service shall be only such service as has been rendered immediately prior to the approval of this act; whereas the original bill does not contain such requirement.

T. G. BURCH,
B. FRANK WHELCHER,
DAVID J. WARD,
FRED A. HARTLEY, Jr.,
N. M. MASON,

Managers on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial showing how Minnesota has altered its laws to conform to the soldiers voting bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD

and to include therein copies of two letters from the Comptroller General.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter I have received from a soldier in the armed forces and to include also a letter I have written to Chester Bowles, head of the O. P. A.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article appearing in this morning's New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONKIEWICZ]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, on Monday next, after disposition of business on the Speaker's table and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART]?

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 473), as follows:

Resolved, That CECIL R. KING of the State of California be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Ways and Means.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING SPEAKER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILL S. 1285

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House the Speaker may be authorized to sign the enrolled bill, S. 1285.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE AND JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL—1945

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4414) making appropriations for the legislative branch and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate continue for 1½ hours, one-half of

that time to be controlled by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON], and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4414, with Mr. RICHARDS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is the annual supply bill for the legislative branch and for the judiciary. In previous bills we have explained to the Congress the workings of the various units of organization under this bill, and I am not going into any extended explanation at this time.

I would like to state that we have been fortunate in the preparation of this bill to have the services of the somewhat new clerk of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. Orescan, who has done a very satisfactory job. Although this is the smallest regular bill coming from the Appropriations Committee, there is no more pleasant committee to serve on than this committee. The associations have been most worth while, and the cooperation of the members of the committee on both sides of the aisle, Mr. HENDRICKS, Mr. GORE, and Mr. KIRWAN on the Democratic side and Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana, Mr. FLOESER, and Mr. TIBBOTT, a new member on the committee, has made very pleasant the few weeks we have spent in examining the requests for appropriations.

As you gentlemen know, the Bureau of the Budget does nothing in the way of preparing and examining appropriations for the legislative branch. It merely transmits them to the Congress. The same is true as to the judiciary appropriation, with the exception that the Bureau of the Budget is authorized to make comments and recommendations if it cares to do so.

The bill this year, as it has been for the last several years, is cut to the bone. I do not want to brag about the judiciary and legislative committee, nor do I want to praise Congress, but I must state that Congress governs itself as far as expenditures are concerned in a very close, economical way. We function up here on the Hill, in my opinion, on as small an amount of money as really is practicable, and I am proud of the fact that the Appropriations Committee which has cut the appropriations of so many of the executive departments has been and is now equally zealous in controlling appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government.

The total amount carried in this bill is approximately \$59,606,000. Of this total, the amount of \$46,000,000, in round numbers, is for the legislative branch and \$13,606,000 for the judiciary.

Of the total of \$46,000,000 carried in the bill for the legislative branch, the amount of \$21,165,000 is chargeable as the total expense of the Congress. This, one of the three great branches of the Government, is run on \$21,000,000 annually. There is a slight increase due to overtime, but the entire operation of running the legislative branch is approximately \$21,000,000. The balance of \$25,000,000 is for the Library of Congress, the Botanic Garden, and the Government Printing Office. Of the \$21,000,000-plus chargeable to Congress, the amount of \$9,602,000 is for the House of Representatives and \$4,057,000 for the Senate.

Just as a matter of information, the amount recommended in the bill is an apparent increase of \$1,467,000 over the current year's appropriation. However, when the cost of additional compensation in lieu of war overtime, which we are required to pay by law, still to be appropriated for the current fiscal year, is added to the appropriation already made, the net result is a decrease of \$37,325 under the requirements for the fiscal year 1944.

The amount of \$59,606,000 carried in the bill is \$2,027,000 under the Budget estimate. The decrease of \$37,325, when compared with 1944 requirements, indicates—and correctly so—that the principal reason for the increase is the additional war compensation.

As much as we would have liked to grant increases in salaries here on the Hill, there are only two slight increases in the bill, one for \$600 and one for \$300, and they were very meritorious.

We increased the amount for the Architect, who is in charge of the physical upkeep and maintenance of this building and other buildings. We allowed this year the amount of \$40,000 for painting the dome of the Capitol. Heretofore this has been done every 4 years but in the interest of economy the item was omitted from the bill last year. Provision for this work had to be made this year because the dome has gone unpainted for 5 years and is deteriorating, or will soon deteriorate, due to the fact that the paint is sloughing off, and good business dictates that that money be spent.

In the operations of the power plant we have had to grant an increase because of the increased price of coal. In the Library we gave a few increases in positions. Fourteen were requested. We allowed seven, and those seven are of a very unusual character. I think every one is for work in connection with some foreign field, principally the Near East and the Far East, dealing with languages and areas that very few people in this country know very much about, and developing information necessary and helpful to our military operations. We have therefore allowed these positions to build up that part of the Library, which needs help and support for the purposes of the war. However, even the cost of these positions will have to be defrayed out of savings that may accrue during the fiscal year. We have allowed a small sum for printing and binding to take care of the accumulation of binding work in the Li-

brary. We declined to appropriate \$300,000 for a new building which was very badly needed. The space in which a cafeteria was previously located cannot be used due to the fire hazard. There are other needs which were very well justified, but we felt it was an expensive proposition at this time, and more expensive now than it probably would be later.

The Government Printing Office had to have this year an increase in its revolving fund, its working capital, and the Deficiency Committee increased the working capital from \$3,000,000 to \$20,000,000. We, in turn, have done the same thing for 1945, because with the vast amount of business they are doing there, it is necessary to have more working capital. It is not a loss, because at the end of 12 months, after the fiscal year is over, that amount must be returned to the Treasury. It is merely working capital.

As to the judiciary part of this bill, practically every increase recommended is due to overtime and to additional expenses required by law. There were some things that we had included under the judiciary items which the full committee struck out, and today I believe the judiciary, presided over by a very marvelous group of men, is performing its work at a minimum of expense, and I personally feel that sometime common justice will demand that we give this important branch of our Government more help than it has at the present time.

I would like to say in conclusion that I think the departments on the Hill are in excellent hands.

On the business side Mr. Shanks and his organization have impressed us with the thoroughness, the interest, and the devotion that they have shown in all matters pertaining to the proper handling of money on the Hill.

The Government Printing Office is a remarkable institution and one that every citizen in this country can be proud of.

The Library of Congress is the largest and greatest library in the world. The Librarian in my opinion, is one of the ablest and most devoted public servants in the employ of the Government today. He is doing a tremendously important job as Librarian, and I think it is time for us all to recognize that fact, and I know that we will continue to be more and more proud of our Library.

There are many other men whom I would like to mention, but time does not permit. I am very confident that the committee has done a sound and conscientious job, and that this Congress can feel gratified in the work being done by the Congress as a legislative department. The Members of this body may feel sure that the most careful and conscientious studies of every kind are conducted by their legislative committees in the interest of good legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. Yes.

Mr. WRIGHT. I think that the trouble with most of this is that we do not utilize the tools that we have. I know that I am to be criticized myself in that respect and it is only recently that I have learned to use the legislative reference.

Mr. O'NEAL. I commend everybody to the use of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library. That service can do the Members inestimable good in research work on subjects to which they themselves have not the time to devote. I believe that possibly in time we may be able to increase the amount given in this bill for this purpose, to the benefit of the Congress itself, and to the people of America, who get much of their information through Congress and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has again expired.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, recently I gave the House information that came to me relative to the sale of dry-cell batteries at the Ogden, Utah, Army Depot. I told the House that I had taken this matter up with Under Secretary of War Patterson, and added he was greatly exercised when he called me on the telephone. He assured me that the Inspector General of the Ninth Service Command would make a complete investigation of the sale of these batteries.

A preliminary investigation was made and then the Inspector General of the Army decided to make a more extensive investigation to definitely fix the responsibility for the sale, so that appropriate action may be taken by the War Department.

Let it be distinctly understood that the War Department in no manner, shape, or form attempts to defend the sale of the batteries at the prices which were received. It admits that there was a serious lack of business judgment. As a result of the preliminary investigation remedial changes have already been instituted to provide for the enforcement of all existing regulations governing the sale and disposal of salvaged property.

I have stated on numerous occasions that there is going to be billions of dollars of surplus property in this country after the war. However, there is a tremendous amount of surplus property at the present time, goods of every description which cannot be purchased in the open market. My contention is that where this class of goods is available, whether it be trucks, motorcycles, all types of consumer goods, or what not, and it has been declared surplus it should be placed on the market because if sold now it in no way interferes with private industry. Then again, when a situation exists that only through the Government can certain items be purchased, certainly we should receive what we paid for the commodities if they are in first-class condition.

I am pleased to say that as a result of the Executive order issued by the President on February 21 which resulted in the appointment of Hon. William L. Clayton as Administrator of the Surplus

War Property Administration, an organization is being set up which in the end should certainly result in the proper distribution of surplus property, and further than that, see that that surplus property is not disposed of at ridiculous prices such as occurred in connection with the sale of the batteries.

Reports of the Inspector General are considered confidential records of the War Department but I have been furnished with a brief of the preliminary investigation of the sale of the batteries. Of course, everyone is going to be greatly disturbed when they read a report of the investigation as it has so far progressed, especially when the information contained in this report confirms the statement I made at the outset. It will be hard for one to understand how an individual, who was a civilian employee of the depot, could purchase surplus property in his own name, especially when it is a violation of an Army regulation to dispose of surplus property in that manner. It is my understanding this employee has been discharged.

The report shows that in one case 25,891 batteries cost the Government \$17,762, and 1,199 batteries cost the Government \$237.55, but the amazing feature is that this civilian employee at the depot offered \$15 for the lot and his offer was accepted. A second lot consisting of 65,909 batteries cost the Government \$142,934. A third lot consisting of 324 batteries cost \$231; 23,587 out of the second and third lots were sold for \$65 to the same civilian employee, and 42,646 were sold to a resident of Utah for \$50. Others, besides this civilian employee, participated in the sale and resale of the batteries. Part of the batteries purchased by the civilian employee were disposed of through a salesman employed by another individual. So far the price received has not been determined. It has been determined, however, that this civilian employee interested his brother in the transaction and that his brother sold part of the batteries for \$20,000. I think that the House and the country are entitled to know the facts in connection with this sale. It is my opinion that when situations such as this are disclosed it will be beneficial to the Government in the handling of surplus property in the future. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I will include as part of my remarks, the information that has been sent to me. The statement in reference to the preliminary investigation that I received follows:

1. This report contains the results of the investigation thus far of the sale of dry-cell batteries at the Army Services Depot, Ogden, Utah. The investigation has not been completed and the results reported at this time must therefore be regarded as tentative only.

2. During the period April 17 to May 1, 1943, the salvage officer at Utah Army Service Depot, Ogden, Utah, received 27,090 dry-cell batteries of various sizes pursuant to the terms of two inventory and inspection reports both dated April 17, 1943. One covered 25,891 dry-cell batteries at a cost to the Government of \$17,762.63 and the other covered 1,199 batteries at a cost to the Government of \$237.55. These batteries were all over-age and therefore no longer suitable for military purposes.

3. On or about April 28, 1943, Mr. J. W. Harbertson approached the salvage officer and asked permission to buy these batteries which

were lying out in the open and were about to be destroyed. He offered a price of \$15.00 for the lot. The salvage officer states that he accepted this offer after securing authority from headquarters, Ninth Service Command, to make the sale. Payment was made in cash by Mr. Harbertson and the money turned into the finance officer at Ogden, Utah. Mr. Harbertson removed the batteries on May 1, 1943.

4. A second lot of dry-cell batteries consisting of 65,909 batteries costing \$142,934.76, and a third lot consisting of 324 batteries costing \$231.06 were received by the same salvage officer in September 1943 pursuant to Reports of Survey dated August 31, 1943, and September 20, 1943, respectively. All these batteries were also over-age and therefore unsuitable for military purposes.

5. The second and third lots were sold by the salvage officer to Mr. J. W. Harbertson, who purchased 23,587 on September 20, 1943 for \$65.00 and Mr. W. W. Grothe of Bountiful, Utah, who purchased 42,646 on September 23, 1943, for \$50.00. These sales were also made by direct negotiations pursuant to authority granted by headquarters, Ninth Service Command.

6. The salvage officer explained to both purchasers that the batteries were over-age and unsuitable for military purposes.

7. Mr. J. W. Harbertson was a civilian employee at the depot. This fact was not developed by the salvage officer at the time of the first sale; whether or not the fact was known by the salvage officer prior to the second sale has not been established. Sale to an employee of the Government is contrary to Army regulations. Some of the batteries acquired by Mr. J. W. Harbertson were disposed of through salesmen employed by one A. W. Schryber. The number so sold and the amounts received for them have not been determined. Mr. J. W. Harbertson interested his brother, James M. Harbertson, of Ogden, Utah, in attempting to dispose of the remaining batteries. Mr. James M. Harbertson sold most of the remaining ones to Jake Hayutin & Sons, of Denver, in November 1943, for \$20,000. On instructions from the Hayutin firm, some or all of the batteries purchased by that firm were shipped to Burstein-Applebee, of Kansas City.

8. The disposition of the batteries purchased by Mr. Grothe is not known. He is not employed by the Government and has not been questioned.

9. There is no evidence thus far of fraud or collusion on the part of the salvage officer or any other employee of the Government.

10. The batteries were turned over to the salvage officer because they had passed the predetermined shelf life which had been established to reflect deterioration due to age.

11. An error was made in disposing of the batteries at prices not in keeping with resale values. Without attempting to change the fact that an error was made, it may be pointed out, however, that the resale value of these batteries appears to be an abnormal situation arising from the shortage of batteries. Dry-cell batteries have little or no salvage value so far as the metal or other material components are concerned. The extent of deterioration resulting from age varies, however, and civilian purchasers were obviously willing to experiment with uncertain quality and indefinite age because first-class goods were not available.

12. The salvage officer had occupied his post for about 1 month; only at the time of the first sale, had had no previous experience with batteries, and believed that he was not only avoiding the expense of removing worthless articles but also securing some revenue. The original purchaser seems to have been equally unaware of the real resale value.

13. The error might have been avoided if the Ninth Service Command had not granted special authority to sell without asking for

written bids. They were authorized, however, to grant special permission for "spot sales" in appropriate cases and did so without being aware of the substantial resale value of the items.

14. Dry-cell batteries are a peculiar item of supply in that they must be stored in sufficient quantities to be available to meet any tactical condition, notwithstanding the fact that they are of a perishable nature. The rate of issue depends on the tactical situation at the particular time and supply must be ample to meet any given situation. Overage batteries cannot be shipped for overseas use, but limited quantities can be issued in the zone of the interior for training purposes. The amount of life left in a given battery depends on the type of battery, the condition under which it was manufactured, and storage conditions. The batteries produced by a competent manufacturer and stored under ideal conditions may have considerable remaining life, while others will be completely dead. The amount of life in any particular battery can be determined only by testing each battery. The cost of such testing would normally be excessive.

15. The following corrective action is being taken as the result of the facts developed thus far concerning this transaction:

a. Discussions are being had with Procurement Division, Treasury Department, for the purpose of determining whether or not it would be practical to turn over to that agency over-age batteries no longer suitable for military purposes. It may be possible for that agency to test and price items in a more satisfactory manner.

b. If the discussions referred to result in the conclusion that it is not practical to dispose of over-age batteries through Treasury Procurement, an attempt will be made to publish for the guidance of salvage officers price lists to be worked out with the assistance of the Office of Price Administration.

c. The possibility of returning over-age batteries to manufacturers on some agreed price basis is also being investigated. It is believed that this procedure would not be as effective as either of the two alternatives previously mentioned, but the possibility of effecting a satisfactory arrangement is being explored.

d. The necessity of having experienced officers assigned as salvage officers will be emphasized again by the publication of a directive to the service commands. The facts developed in this case will be cited as an illustration of necessity for selecting experienced officers.

e. The service commands are being advised again that property will be sold only on widely circulated written invitations for bids, unless the facts submitted clearly demonstrate that special permission to effect sale by some other method is in the best interest of the Government.

f. The Ninth Service Command is being advised of the contents of this report and requested to advise headquarters as to corrective action taken and to be taken in that Command.

16. The investigation is being continued for the purpose of determining responsibility for the errors made and what further corrective action should be taken.

Mr. Speaker, Washington is full of individuals hungry to get their hands on surplus property. Undoubtedly they recall what happened when surplus property was disposed of during and after the First World War. I am sure many of the old Members of the House recall the scandals that developed as a result of the disposition of that surplus property and as Under Secretary of War Patterson says, "That must not happen again."

Why, Mr. Speaker, one individual advertised in the New York Times seeking

clients that he desires to serve in connection with the purchase of surplus Government property stating that he had had 6 months' experience and indicating in the advertisement that he understood the procedure. In my opinion surplus property should be sold in the open market and bids should be received. Where the prices offered are ridiculous they should not be accepted.

It is not only certain groups that seek to secure surplus property at ridiculous prices. Strange to say, Mr. Speaker, some of the corporations likewise follow such a policy. For instance, there are 4,000 motorcycles available now and I have learned they have never been used. The official in charge offered those motorcycles to the manufacturers, and although the Government paid the manufacturers \$400 apiece for them, their top offer was \$130 apiece. These motorcycles are in the hands of the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department and I have learned from the Chief of that Division, Hon. Clifton Mack, that he will not sell the motorcycles at the price offered, but he has gone out in the field to secure higher bids and at the time I talked to him he had bids as high as \$300 apiece. But why should we not receive what we paid for those motorcycles in view of the fact that you cannot purchase them in the open market?

The House in the last session passed a surplus property bill, but that bill, I understand, does not go far enough. The bill has been reported by the Senate committee and is on the calendar. It is my hope that bill will be passed at an early date by the Senate and sent to conference and there a real law, with teeth in it, could be agreed upon.

While the President has set up by Executive order this Surplus War Property Administration as a result of the report by Mr. Baruch and Mr. Hancock, still Congress has a duty to perform and legislation should be speedily enacted. I urged the President, because I could not see that Congress would expedite legislation on this subject, to set up a special agency to handle surplus property. My communication reached him however on the very date he issued the Executive order.

My contacts with Mr. Clayton and with Mr. Mack of the Procurement Division, whom I am pleased to know will handle the disposition of consumer goods that are declared surplus, convinced me that we have two excellent administrators.

In conclusion I want to again emphasize the feeling of the Under Secretary of War and his associates with respect to the sales that have already been disclosed, such as the sale of certain tools in Michigan and the sale of these batteries, and to know that the investigation is being continued and corrective action will be taken when they determine the responsibility for the mistakes.

The gentleman from Utah [Mr. Robinson] rendered assistance in pressing the investigation.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I want to tell the gentleman from Missouri that he is bringing

to us a great contribution. In my State of Nebraska we had demands for batteries on the farms for many, many months. Many of my farmers who are isolated from railroads and the telephone, depend upon the radio for their information and the dealers out there cannot supply them with batteries. There was a sale of N. Y. A. goods in my home town. We were told that the surplus materials were going to be advertised and sold to the highest bidder. Yet many of the people in my locality were unable to get information as to how to bid, with the result that many pieces of valuable material were sold for a ridiculously low sum of money. There were trucks, typewriters, and many other things. The price which the Government received for this material was so small that the people were very much disturbed. I think the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] is doing us a great good here today in bringing this out into the light because the people of America will not stand for this surplus material getting into the hands of one monopoly or one individual. We think it ought to be advertised for bids and go through the regular channels of trade, so the people who need batteries can have them. They are producing food out there and they need this information. We need these batteries for the radios.

Mr. COCHRAN. I will say to the gentleman it is my contention that where the Government has surplus property in good condition that cannot be purchased in the open market, then we certainly should receive the price we paid for it when the Government sells it.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to compliment the gentleman and thank him for his contribution in thus turning the fierce light of publicity on this sort of thing, which will help to prevent it until we can get further legislation to control it.

Mr. COCHRAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, I do want to thank the gentleman for his contribution. I would further call his attention to this observation which I wish to make, that within the shadow of this House there have been surplus goods disposed of by the Treasury Department of an item that ordinarily calls for a price of \$20 to \$30 on the market, which has been purchased by a Member of the House brand new, for 80 cents apiece.

Mr. COCHRAN. I know nothing about any such transaction.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. I want to compliment the gentleman on his disclosures. I would like to have his reaction as to whether or not this ridiculously low price was due to the dishonesty of the men handling it, or was it due to the system we have for getting rid of our surplus property?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. I will say to the gentleman that as a result of this disclosure, the Army already has changed its regulations, which will be beneficial in the future. The Army wants to protect itself against criticism. It wants to stop all such deals as this. But I will also say in reference to the statement that the gentleman from Arizona made, that the House passed the surplus property bill in the last session. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] handled that bill. It is still over in the Senate. We should get action in the Senate, I hope, at an early date. If the Senate will pass that bill and send it back to the House and let it go to conference, then we can write a real law in conference. That is what we need to protect the taxpayers of this country and to prevent having their surplus property sold at ridiculous prices.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. NORRELL. We had a similar scandal in Arkansas about the sale of surplus property. We had two or three investigating committees go down there and the net result was that a lot of property was given away, but it was done under the present existing laws and there was no other course for them to take. If that is true, I think it is up to Congress, and I hope the Senate will pass some kind of bill so that we now could enact proper legislation which is so needed for the disposal of this property.

Mr. COCHRAN. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. All of these matters were pointed out when the House passed the bill for the orderly disposition of surplus property last year. At that time it was shown there are probably more than 100 statutes of various kind authorizing the disposition of surplus property.

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes, and the gentleman from Mississippi is to be complimented for reporting that bill and securing its passage.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I shall take only a few minutes to discuss the bill under consideration. As our chairman has so well said, this bill is probably the smallest appropriation bill that comes before the Congress for consideration, although it is a very important bill and carries items of great importance. The committee worked hard and conducted the hearings to the fullest degree possible in an attempt to bring out all the information bearing upon the various items in the bill before the House that it was possible to get. I cannot pay too high a compliment to the members of the committee. We are very happy that in this committee we have had no division along

partisan lines. We have worked hard trying to write a bill that was a good bill. While I take no particular pride in recommending this as a good bill, I will say that under the circumstances, and in view of our means of getting information, it is as good a bill as we could arrive at. But until such time as we are able to get information from sources other than the people who request these funds and determine what the function of their particular department shall be, we probably will not be able to do it any better than we have. The clerk of the committee, Mr. Ruskin, has been very helpful and very diligent in his efforts to assist the committee. Taking it all in all I believe that we do have the best sort of bill that it was possible to bring out under the circumstances.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNES].

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, for more than a year now, I have been trying to help the several manufacturers of work gloves in my State and district in their struggle to supply the critical and steadily increasing demands for their products. This whole industry has been so completely bogged down in the swamp of bureaucratic regulations and restrictions that it simply has no hope of providing the millions of gloves that workers in war plants, on farms and on railroads must have to do heavy and difficult work with their hands.

Let me recount some of the glove manufacturer's troubles. First, W. P. B. sharply restricted the available materials, and forced drastic changes in almost every company's line. The manufacturers, however, took that hurdle pretty well in stride. Next, O. P. A. stepped in with price ceilings and quality formulas which added greatly to the manufacturers' burdens. Everything else being favorable, however, the average company would have survived these restrictions. But the Administration's wage stabilization program has proved to be the final straw.

Wage scales in the glove industry at the time of the freeze were far below scales in most war industries, and it was perfectly obvious from the start that the glove manufacturers could not hope to recruit new help or even keep their normal working forces unless they were permitted to increase their pay schedules sharply.

All these problems of this industry are as old as the emergency. The inevitable failure of the industry should have been apparent to any intelligent schoolboy. And it should have been equally obvious that work gloves are an absolute essential in the war effort.

But today, vital war work everywhere is suffering because men and women simply cannot buy satisfactory work gloves. Hardly a day passes that I don't

receive letters of protest from men in steel mills, glass plants, on farms, and on railroads, and their complaints are certainly justified.

Without adequate protection for their hands, men simply cannot handle hot steel and glass, or a thousand different rough, heavy, or dangerous objects which must be handled; and nobody with an ounce of common sense would expect them to do so.

These glove manufacturers and I, however, have so far failed to find a single official in a position of authority here in Washington who seems to have that necessary ounce of common sense or foresight.

Considered in the superficial manner, the problem of supplying gloves to our millions of essential workers may seem trivial. Maybe it is asking too much to expect bureaucrats, whose hardest work has been heavy thinking, to know what burned, blistered, or lacerated hands can do to a workingman's efficiency.

So this looks like another one of the little oversights which may loom up surprisingly large in the final cost.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER].

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, we have just learned that the English House of Parliament has extended an invitation to Members of the United States Congress, to visit and observe that body. I think this is an appropriate thing to do. Not only could we profit by studying and observing the procedure of the British Parliament but we could profit by doing the same thing in the case of similar nations—for instance the South American Governments.

It was my privilege and pleasure some months ago to be invited to sit in a session of the British House of Commons—not as a spectator from the Gallery—but as an observer from the floor of the Chamber—accompanied by a well-equipped parliamentarian who explained the procedure as they went along. In many respects the Congress of the United States and the House of Commons have many angles of procedure in common, but I observed one phase that is entirely different from our procedure here in the House of Representatives. On the day I was there, November 21, they submitted a series of questions to be answered by the Secretary of State for War at the first sitting of that body after the 23d of November. In other words, they gave the Secretary of State for War at least 2 days to prepare the answers.

I am here including these questions that were asked that day. I am sure they will be of interest to Members interested in this procedure.

QUESTIONS FOR ORAL ANSWER

1. Sir William Wayland: To ask the Secretary of State for War, if officers quartered in towns where their homes are situated can be allowed to reside with their families instead of having to live in barracks, or, in some cases, where barrack accommodation is not available, to pay for accommodation in hotels.

2. Sir William Wayland: To ask the Secretary of State for War, why there is no prospect of promotion to noncommissioned rank for privates in the Army Dental Corps at

Army dental centers, casualty clearing stations, and military and base hospitals; why the sole exception is made for clerk orderlies in field ambulance units; and is he aware that the ordinary service clerk orderly in the Army Dental Corps who carries no rank has important duties to carry out and responsibilities equal to those of a battalion orderly-room sergeant or battalion quartermaster sergeant.

3. Mr. Hannah: To ask the Secretary of State for War, whether he can hold out any hope of widowed mothers of soldiers being put on the same footing as soldiers' wives in the matter of allowances.

4. Mr. Thorne: To ask the Secretary of State for War, how many civilian doctors have passed through an Army school of hygiene course; and how many have taken courses for treating mechanical warfare casualties.

5. Mr. Gordon Macdonald: To ask the Secretary of State for War, whether he is aware that the holding of mock invasions sometimes interferes drastically with war production; and will he take such steps as will reduce such interference to a minimum.

6. Sir Richard Acland: To ask the Secretary of State for War, for how long was the Army Forms Depot without stocks of the form for making application for allowances to dependents of men serving in the Army; and what is the position now.

7. Sir Richard Acland: To ask the Secretary of State for War, whether any instructions or advice has been sent to commanding officers of units on the subject of the new allowances to dependents of men serving in the Army.

8. Sir Richard Acland: To ask the Secretary of State for War, whether he will equip the London Regional Education Committee, and other similar committees, with magic lanterns so as to facilitate the giving of interesting lectures to military units.

9. Mr. Bellenger: To ask the Secretary of State for War, whether he has considered the organization and publicity methods adopted by the Royal Air Force in recruiting for the Air Training Corps; and what proposals he has for adopting a similar system in connection with the Army.

10. Mr. Bellenger: To ask the Secretary of State for War, what instructions have been issued to paymasters where soldiers who have received an overissue of pay, due to their names wrongly appearing in part II, Orders, have incurred substantial debts, as considerable hardship is being caused in innumerable cases of this nature through no fault of the soldiers concerned.

11. Mr. Bellenger: To ask the Secretary of State for War, what arrangements are made for journalists and photographers to accompany Army units on active operations against the enemy; and whether any similar procedure is adopted to that employed by the German Army whereby journalists and photographers are incorporated in the ranks of the army for the purpose of recording operations, either to be utilized in instruction of troops in tactics or by way of making documentary films for release to the general public.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. In that connection, not necessarily in connection with the questions propounded on the floor of the House of Commons, but in connection with the invitation that is to be extended to this body that we send representatives of our group to London to fraternize, as it were, with members of Parliament and the House of Lords, what is the gentleman's opinion on that?

Mr. SNYDER. As I said in my opening remarks, I think this is the appropriate thing to do. That is, to visit, sit

in, observe, and listen to the procedure in bodies similar to ours, such as the British Parliament.

Mr. CELLER. Then I take it you are in fullest accord with the resolution that has already been adopted by both houses of the British Parliament. Does not the gentleman think we should take appropriate action as soon as the invitation has been formally extended to us?

Mr. SNYDER. I would not want to express an opinion about when we should take appropriate action. I would rather leave that to the leadership.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] such time as he may desire.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order and to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE (H. RES. 462)

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, on February 17 I presented a question to the House involving the privileges of the House and presented a resolution—House Resolution 446—which on motion of the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. On March 6, 1944, I presented an amended resolution—House Resolution 462—which was also referred to the Judiciary Committee.

The discussion of the question, which I shall make today for the Record, has already been presented to the Judiciary Committee in the nature of a preliminary brief. My discussion must be incomplete in detail at this time but I am prepared to amplify the points on the appropriate occasion, and present additional authorities.

IN SUPPORT OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 446, AS AMENDED AND AMPLIFIED IN HOUSE RESOLUTION 462 (BY MR. HINSHAW) ON THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE AS AFFECTED BY THE PROPOSED MEXICAN TREATY

The resolution—House Resolution 446—refers to the House Judiciary Committee the question of whether or not the proposed treaty with Mexico which the President transmitted to the Senate of the United States on February 15, 1944, invades the constitutional prerogatives of the House of Representatives. In the amended form—House Resolution 462—the resolution suggests 10 questions which may be grouped under 5 principal headings:

First. Does the proposed treaty undertake to dispose of "property belonging to the United States" in violation of paragraph 2 of section 3 of article IV of the Constitution of the United States?—First to sixth questions inclusive.

Second. Does the proposed treaty undertake to authorize diversions from and obstructions in the navigable waters of the United States in violation of paragraph 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States?—Seventh question.

Third. Does the proposed treaty undertake to commit or obligate the United States, without action by Congress, to raising, appropriating, and expending money for the construction of public works in violation of any provision of the Constitution vesting such powers in Congress?—Eighth question.

Fourth. Does the proposed treaty undertake to fix and determine what taxes, duties, imposts, or excises may or may not be laid and collected, in certain instances, in violation of paragraph 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States?—Ninth question.

Fifth. Does the proposed treaty undertake to fix and determine, without action by Congress, who may enter the United States without any immigration restrictions, passports, or labor requirements in violation of any provision of the Constitution vesting legislative powers in Congress?—Tenth question.

I

THE TREATY UNDERTAKES TO DISPOSE OF PROPERTY BELONGING TO THE UNITED STATES IN VIOLATION OF PARAGRAPH 2, SECTION 3, ARTICLE IV OF CONSTITUTION

This question should be considered under two heads: First, "property belonging to the United States" which the treaty undertakes to dispose of without action by Congress; and second, property which the treaty undertakes to dispose of to the prejudice of the claims of the States of California, Arizona, and Nevada. The first heading in turn will be treated under two heads according to the kind of property affected by the treaty, to wit: (a) Water or the right to the use of water belonging to the United States and given to Mexico and also (b) the right given to Mexico to the beneficial use of dams, canals, works, and structures belonging to the United States.

A. Property belonging to the United States is disposed of by the treaty since it gives Mexico, first, water and water right; and second, the right to the beneficial use of reservoirs, canals, and structures of the United States; and third, makes disposition of the electricity generated at said works.

First. The water or the right to the beneficial use of water belonging to the United States which this treaty undertakes to give to Mexico is property within the meaning of paragraph 2 of section 3 of article IV of the Constitution and a lawful disposal thereof can be made only by Congress and not by the President and Senate alone.

(a) While it is generally true that there can be no title or ownership of the corpus or body of running water in the natural flow of a stream, yet the usufruct or right to use such water is capable of ownership and is property.

(b) When, however, the running water has been reduced to possession by being impounded and stored in a reservoir, its corpus then becomes the subject of ownership and it, too, is property.

(c) Furthermore, the fact that the water once stored is subsequently released and returned to the stream bed does not change its character or impair the title thereto if the owner intends thereby to adopt the stream channel as

his means of transportation to place of use lower down on the stream.

These general rules are set forth in 2 Kinney on Irrigation and Water Rights 1339-1341 as follows:

No man, State or Nation can receive or give an absolute title to it (water) while it is still flowing naturally in the streams.

It therefore follows from the other principles that the sale of a water right by its owner does not convey any specific quantity of water itself, but only sells the right to the use of the water for the reason that the only property owned by an appropriator is the right to use it. . . . But after the water itself has been actually diverted from the stream and taken into the possession of the appropriator in his ditches, canals or reservoirs, the title to the same changed and it becomes the absolute property of the appropriator. . . . After it has been captured, as it were, or diverted from the natural channel of the stream by an individual and taken absolute possession of by him in the ditches, canals, reservoirs of other receptacles constructed or prepared by his work and labor, it is as much his private property as anything else that is reduced to possession which otherwise would be lost to the uses of man.

Right to the use of stored water: After water has been once stored in reservoirs it becomes personal property and may be sold, contracted for, and disposed of as such property. (2 Kinney on Irrigation and Water Rights, 2d ed., 1484-1485; 1 Weil Water Rights in Western States 755-758.)

The use of developed water belongs to the persons who by their own exertions discovered and developed the water, so far as their needs and necessities require. The water thus developed may be turned into a natural stream and conducted therein to the place of use and there recaptured by the parties developing the same." (2 Kinney, 2187-2188.)

To same effect see 1 Weil Water Rights in Western States 37-41.

However, it makes little difference in the present inquiry whether we consider that the treaty disposes of specified quantities of the "corpus" of the waters of the Colorado River, as released by the United States from its reservoirs on that stream, or that the treaty accords Mexico the rights to the beneficial use of so much water of the Colorado River. In either event the subject matter is "property" and within the provisions of paragraph 2, section 3 of article IV of the Constitution vesting the power to make such disposition in Congress.

Second. The right to the beneficial use of dams, canals, works, and structures of the United States which the treaty bestows upon Mexico is property within the meaning of paragraph 2 of section 3 of article IV of the Constitution and a lawful disposal thereof can be made only by Congress itself.

The treaty undertakes to bestow on Mexico the beneficial use of the following properties of the United States:

(a) Boulder Dam and Reservoir, although not specifically named therein, because without this great storage reservoir—capacity twice the average annual flow of the river—the treaty guarantees could not be fulfilled.

(b) The Davis Dam and Reservoir—article 12 (b) of treaty.

(c) Imperial Dam and All American Canal—article 11 (c), article 12 (c), and article 14 of treaty.

(d) Rockwood heading and Alamo Canal—article 11 (c) and article 12 (c) of treaty.

(e) That the use for the benefit of Mexico of other works not specifically named is contemplated by the treaty is evident by the first sentence of article 10 and by general provisions obligating the United States to "construct or acquire works that may be necessary to convey a part of the Colorado River to Mexico."

Fifty, C. J. on Property defines "property" to include or mean—page 729:

In law—generally. The term "property" is in law a generic term of extensive application. It is a term of large import, of broad and exceedingly complex meaning, of the broadest and most extensive signification, a very comprehensive word and is the most comprehensive of all terms which can be used.

Page 730 as right or interest:

Primarily in its appropriate sense, in the broader sense, in legal conception, in a legal sense, or in the strict legal sense, the term "property" signifies valuable right or interest considered primarily as a source or element of wealth or any civil right of a pecuniary nature or as an aggregate of rights which are guaranteed and protected by the Government.

Page 732:

The right of user is an essential quality or attribute of absolute property without which absolute property can have no existence. There can be no conception of property aside from its control and use and upon its use depends its value. In fact it has been stated that the right to enjoy the beneficial use of property is the most real and practical idea of the nature of property, that property in anything consists in the use, the legal right to use and derive a profit from lands and other things is property, and that the use of property is property.

Ditches, canals, flumes, and reservoirs used for the conveyance or storage of water courses, lakes, or ponds are real property and the rules of law governing the same are in general the same as the rules governing other real property. (2 Kinney on Irrigation and Water Rights, 2d ed. 1462.)

Third. By article 19, the treaty undertakes to make disposition of electric power which the two Governments may develop at international plants. The treaty, in article 2, defines the meaning of the words "two governments" in such a manner as to entirely exclude Congress. It there says:

Wherever there are provisions in this treaty for joint action or joint agreement by the two governments . . . it shall be understood that the particular matter in question shall be handled by or through the Department of State of the United States and the Ministry of Foreign Relations of Mexico.

But in *Ashwander v. T. V. A.* (297 U. S. 288, 330) the Court said:

The water power which was an inevitable incident of the construction of the dam (Wilson Dam) the right to convert it into electric energy and the energy thus produced constitute property belonging to the United States.

The express power of Congress under the Constitution to dispose of property belonging to the United States is not abridged or withdrawn by the 9 or 10 amendments.

And again in *Ashwander v. T. V. A.* (297 U. S. 288, 333) the Supreme Court declared:

That the water power, and the electric energy generated at the dam, are susceptible of disposition as property belonging to the United States is well established.

Therefore, any disposition of electricity belonging to the United States must be made by Congress as provided in article IV, section 3, paragraph 2.

B. The treaty and the disposition of property proposed thereunder operate to prejudice the claims of the States of California, Arizona, and Nevada in violation of paragraph 2 of section 3 of article IV and amendment 5 of the Constitution.

By the terms of the Boulder Canyon Project Act the United States could not commence construction of Boulder Dam until contracts were first obtained assuring the repayment of its cost.

CONTRACTS

First. California power contracts: In 1930 and 1931 the United States executed contracts for the sale of "falling water" for the generation of electricity at Boulder Dam with various California municipalities, including Los Angeles, Burbank, Glendale, and Pasadena, with the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California and with private power corporations, including the Southern California Edison Co., Los Angeles Gas & Electric Corporation, and the Southern Sierras Power Co.

California water contracts: Later the United States also executed contracts for the delivery of water out of Boulder Dam and Reservoir for domestic and irrigation uses at various points on the river below Boulder, with the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, the city and county of San Diego, Imperial Irrigation District, Palo Verde Irrigation District, and Coachella Valley County Water District. These contracts for power and water were sufficient in amount to assure the Government the repayment of its costs in building Boulder Dam. The aggregate annual net diversions from the river covered by the California contracts is 5,362,000 acre-feet.

For contracts see Wilbur & Ely; the Hoover Dam Contracts, pages 291-369.

Second. Nevada contracts: The United States in 1942 executed a contract with the State of Nevada for the delivery of water out of Boulder Dam and Reservoir of 100,000 acre-feet per annum, and in February 1944, executed a second contract with Nevada for an additional 200,000 acre-feet per year.

Third. Arizona contract: On February 10, 1944, the United States entered into a contract with the State of Arizona for the delivery to it, for use in that State, of 2,800,000 acre-feet per annum of Colorado River water.

Fourth. Summary of water supply and required uses: The total water supply is subject to alternating wet and dry cycles of from 7 to 11 years. It is estimated by the Bureau of Reclamation, based on studies of stream flow over a period of 44 years, that the total average releases of water available from Boulder Dam in the future, during critical dry cycles extending over 10 or more years, will

be 8,500,000 acre-feet per year. The supply and draft thereon is estimated as follows:

Annual supply of water	
	Acre-feet
Outflow from Boulder Dam.....	8,500,000
Reservoir and other river losses below Boulder Dam.....	600,000
Available for use.....	7,900,000
Annual requirements for withdrawal and use	
	Acre-feet
Nevada contracts.....	300,000
California contracts.....	5,362,000
Arizona contract.....	2,800,000
Proposed Mexican treaty.....	1,500,000
Total.....	9,962,000
Available supply.....	7,900,000
Requirements.....	9,962,000
Deficit.....	2,062,000

These figures show that any water guaranteed to Mexico must be taken from United States commitments heretofore made to our own communities and States.

Fifth. The contractual claims of the States of California, Arizona, and Nevada are prejudiced and will be seriously injured by the proposed treaty. Relying upon said contracts executed with the United States pursuant to an act of Congress, the California communities have committed themselves to the expenditure of over a half billion dollars for the construction of works with which to utilize Boulder water and power. These obligations are:

Boulder Dam and power plant.....	\$125,000,000
Metropolitan aqueduct.....	274,000,000
All-American Canal.....	78,000,000
San Diego aqueduct.....	16,000,000
Power transmission lines of the city of Los Angeles and private power companies.....	56,000,000
Total.....	549,000,000

Of the foregoing, more than \$400,000,000 have now been actually expended and are represented by bonds and contracts to repay.

The contracts and commitments made by the United States to furnish water to the States of Nevada and Arizona have led to large commitments and expenditures by and in those States.

Now the executive department reports to the Senate a treaty with Mexico which in its disposition of Colorado River water, water rights, electric power, and property would mean that the United States repudiates its contracts with its own communities and States to their serious injury and damage, in violation of paragraph 2 of section 3 of article IV of the Constitution.

Sixth. There is little discussion of, and not very much light which can be thrown upon, the part of the Constitution forbidding prejudicing claims of States. However, in 2 Cooley on the Constitution, at page 202, under chapter 31, headed "Powers of Congress," that authority states:

The next clause of the same article is: "The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to

prejudice any claims of the United States, or of any particular States" (art. IV, sec. 3, clause 2).

The proviso thus annexed to the power is certainly proper in itself and was rendered necessary by the jealousies and questions concerning the western territory which have been already alluded to under the preceding head. It was perhaps suggested by the clause in the ninth article of the confederation which contained a proviso "that no State should be deprived of its territory for the benefit of the United States * * *". The power is not confined to the territory of the United States but extends to "other property" belonging to the United States; so that it may be applied to the due regulation of all other personal and real property rightfully belonging to the United States. And so it has been constantly understood and acted upon (204).

We think that the author could have added with equal force "and subject to the same proviso and limitation."

II

The proposed treaty does authorize substantial diversions from and permanent obstructions in the Colorado River, part of the navigable waters of the United States, without action by Congress, in violation of paragraph 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

A. If this proposed treaty becomes effective, the United States guarantees Mexico the delivery of 1,500,000 acre-feet of Colorado River water per annum, which in some years of drought will be all the water that will ever reach the international boundary line. Furthermore, under the terms of this treaty, Mexico may take all the waters of the river available to her and leave the bed of the river dry. The treaty provides further that a substantial part of the 1,500,000 acre-feet of water directly allocated shall be diverted at points within the United States and permits all the remainder to be diverted "in the limitrophe section of the river"—the 20-mile section where the river is the common boundary—at a point where the easterly half of the Colorado constitutes navigable waters of the United States.

First. The navigable capacity of a river can be injured, obstructed, or destroyed by diversions from the channel of the stream—*Sanitary District v. United States* (266 U. S. 405, 426); *United States v. Rio Grande Co.* (174 U. S. 690-708-709).

B. By this treaty Mexico is permitted to construct and maintain a permanent dam in the limitrophe section of the river—where it is common to both countries, article 12 (a) of the treaty—and in addition, during the 5-year period following the treaty going into force and effect, Mexico is given the privilege of constructing, maintaining, and operating a "temporary diversion structure in the bed of the Colorado River in the territory of the United States for the purpose of diverting water therefrom into the Alamo Canal"; article 27 of the treaty.

In *Ashwander v. T. V. A.* (297 U. S. 288, 328), the Supreme Court said:

Commerce includes navigation. "All America understands and has uniformly understood," said Chief Justice Marshall in *Gibson v. Ogden* (9 Wheat. 1, 190) "the word 'commerce' to comprehend navigation." The power to regulate interstate commerce em-

braces the power to keep the navigable rivers of the United States free from obstructions to navigation and to remove such obstructions when they exist. "For these purposes," said the Court in *Gilman Philadelphia* (3 Wall. 713, 725), "Congress possesses all the powers which existed in the States before the adoption of the National Constitution and which existed in the Parliament in England."

In *United States v. Appalachian Power* (311 U. S. 377, 405), the Court said:

Congress has power under the Constitution (commerce clause) to regulate navigation. It may legislate to forbid or license dams in the water, its power over improvements for navigation in rivers is "absolute."

In *Arizona v. California et al.* (283 U. S. 423, 453) the Supreme Court found the Colorado River a navigable river and said:

We know judicially, from the evidence of history, that a large part of the Colorado River south of Black Canyon was formerly navigable and that the main obstacles to navigation have been the accumulations of silt coming down from the upper reaches of the river system and the irregularity in the flow due to periods of low water. Commercial disuse resulting from changed geographical conditions and a congressional failure to deal with them, does not amount to an abandonment of a navigable river or prohibit future exertions of Federal control (*Economy Light & Power Co. v. United States*, 256 U. S. 113, 118, 124).

Since the Colorado River is a navigable river by the declaration of Congress in the Boulder Canyon Project Act and by the decision of the United States Supreme Court and so acknowledged to be by Mexico in existing treaties, Congress is the department of government vested by the Constitution with the supreme and absolute power to regulate the same.

III

The treaty unquestionably commits the United States to raising, appropriating and expending large sums of money for the construction, operation, and maintenance of projects and work unauthorized by Congress. As examples note the following:

First. By article 5 of the treaty, the United States is obligated to participate in the construction, operation, and maintenance on the main channel of the Rio Grande of, first, three dams which the treaty says are required for the conservation, storage, and regulation of the waters of that river; and, second, dams which may be required for the diversion of its waters. The number of diversion dams to be built is not specified but is left to be determined in the future by the Commission. The share of the costs of all these works which the United States must pay is fixed, for storage dams, proportionate to the capacity therein allotted to our country and for diversion dams the cost is divided "in proportion to the benefits which the respective countries receive therefrom, as determined by the Commission." The cost estimates for these structures is not given and probably is not now known by anyone but the share which the United States must pay will certainly run into many millions of dollars.

Second. By article 7 of the treaty, the United States is obligated to pay half the cost of constructing certain hydroelec-

tric generating plants on the Rio Grande. By that article "each Government agrees to construct through its section of the Commission such works as may be recommended by the Commission and approved by the two Governments. Both Governments through their respective sections of the Commission shall operate and maintain jointly such hydroelectric plants." "Two Governments" is defined in article 2 to be, for the purposes of "joint action or joint agreement" the Department of State of the United States and the Ministry of Foreign Relations of Mexico.

Third. By article 12 (b) of the treaty, the United States is obligated to construct the Davis Dam entirely at its own expense.

Fourth. By article 23 of the treaty, the United States is obligated to pay the entire cost of acquiring any and all private property within the United States which may be required for the construction of works proposed by the treaty or determined by the Commission with the approval of our State Department as being "required for the execution and performance of this treaty."

Where are the millions of dollars required for the above public works coming from? The money is not now in the Treasury. It must be raised for this purpose by Congress either by revenue bills which must originate in the House—article I, section 7 of the Constitution—or by borrowing, which is a power vested in Congress—article I, section 8, paragraph 1 of the Constitution. But the determination of what projects the money shall be used to build is reserved, by the treaty, to the Commission with the approval of our State Department. The Constitution is clear that these things can be done only by Congress and not by the President and the Senate acting by themselves.

IV

The treaty unquestionably undertakes to determine, fix, and decide without action by Congress matters relating to duties, imposts, and excises, and to provide for the free entry into our country of "all materials, implements, equipment, and repair parts intended for the construction, operation, and maintenance of such works" as are proposed to be constructed and operated in the execution of the treaty—article 20 of the treaty. This certainly violates paragraph 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution, which vests this power in Congress.

V

The treaty unquestionably authorizes the migration into this country of all persons, whether Mexican citizens or other nationals, who are employed "either directly or indirectly" on the construction, operation, or maintenance of the works proposed for the execution of the treaty, "without any immigration restrictions, passports, or labor requirements"—article 20 of the treaty. Some of these persons may be highly objectionable from the standpoint of our laws or our national policy. Immigration regulations have long been considered a proper subject for legislation by Congress under paragraph 1 of section 9 of article I and

the last paragraph of section 8 of article I, which vests in Congress power "to make all laws which shall be necessary or proper for carrying into execution" the express powers granted to Congress.

VI

CONCLUSION

First. I believe that the pending inquiry has a broader significance than the subject matter of the present resolution, important as I believe that to be. Our people and our Nation are now contemplating the post-war era. It is evident that sooner or later treaties are going to be suggested which may affect deeply our economic life and well being, the political structure of our Government, and even our preconceived ideas of government in relation to its citizens within and to the people of the world without. Will the House of Representatives play a rightful part in any such world movement, exert its proper influences on any such important and far-reaching treaties by the full discharge of the constitutional powers entrusted to it, or will it as the peoples' representative body be content to stand idly by as an onlooker while all the world about us, including our own American way of life, is changed by treaties?

Second. I do not contend here that the Congress has or should have treaty-making powers, but I do contend that in order to be valid and effective any treaty which intends by its terms to accomplish matters which are entrusted to the Congress, or which the Congress is charged to perform, requires either prior authorization by the Congress or that it be subject to subsequent act of Congress.

If that is not the clear intent of the Constitution, then the treaty-making agencies can by treaty both amend any laws enacted by the Congress and effectively enact new statutes, thereby annulling the powers of the House of Representatives and amending the Constitution itself. The Constitution would, indeed, have created a Frankenstein that could, and would ultimately, destroy its creator.

But no responsible authority has yet contended that the treaty-making power is unlimited. All agree that the treaty-making power is limited. Nevertheless, the treaty-making agencies are now going beyond their acknowledged limitations by undertaking to operate on subjects and within legislative fields declared by the Constitution expressly to be entrusted to the Congress.

Shall the House of Representatives supinely and silently submit now to this whittling-down process of its admittedly constitutional powers and prerogatives? If the treaty-making agencies of the Government can effectively discharge, in this instance, some of the powers which the Constitution vests in Congress, why can't they do it in other instances, and, finally, why can't they do it in all instances where it serves their purpose or meets their desires?

I believe there can be no distinction made in the degree of encroachment upon the rights of Congress. In principle there can be no difference between

a large and a small trespass, for if the treaty-making agencies can invade the constitutional powers of Congress and of the House of Representatives in one particular, they can invade those powers in all particulars.

Rights which are not defended will soon cease to exist. Putney on Constitutional Law, at pages 292 and 293, says:

Foreign countries dealing with our own are supposed to be acquainted with the general nature of our Government and of the limitations of the powers of each department. The greatest disgrace or danger with which our country can be threatened is the cowardly surrender by one department to any usurpation of powers by another.

Again at page 293 Mr. Putney says:

The treaty-making powers of the President and Senate together is not unlimited. The Constitution provides: "This Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof and all treaties made or which shall be made under the authority of the United States shall be the supreme law of the land."

Treaties, therefore, are not the supreme law of the land by themselves but in connection with the Constitution and law of the United States. What is the order of precedence among these three? It is almost unnecessary to state that the Constitution of the United States must come first. An instrument which requires the vote of two-thirds of both Houses of Congress and of three-fourths of the States for its amendment cannot be changed by the President and Senate.

Third. From the discussion which has gone before, it must be apparent that the proposed Mexican treaty undertakes to operate on subjects and within legislative fields declared by the Constitution to be expressly entrusted to Congress. In three instances, to wit, the disposal of property belonging to the United States, the control over the navigable waters of the United States, and the regulation of duties, imposts, and excises, the treaty makes a direct invasion of the express powers of Congress and of the House of Representatives. Again, the United States is obligated to raise and expend large sums of money for public works unauthorized by Congress, which certainly constitutes an indirect invasion of the powers expressly given to Congress and to the House of Representatives to raise revenue, to pay debts, and to appropriate money. In another instance, the treaty regulates migration of aliens into this country which, if not a direct invasion of an express power, is certainly a direct invasion of an implied power of Congress and of the House of Representatives to deal with the subject of aliens.

Fourth. I believe that for the protection of the rights of the House of Representatives, the proposed Mexican treaty should be protested as an invasion of its constitutional prerogatives.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] 5 minutes.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand an editorial from the Weymouth Gazette, of Weymouth, Mass., in the district which I represent, reading in part as follows:

Never, in our rather lengthy newspaper experience, have we observed such a tidal

wave of public resentment as that which developed on Monday within a few brief hours over the summary ousting of George E. Lane as chairman of the Weymouth Price and Rationing Board by the Regional (Boston) O. P. A. Office. And the wave increases in proportion with every passing day.

The O. P. A. Regional Office threw Mr. Lane out on the grounds that he violated regulations stipulating that rationing board members cannot participate in politics by holding public office. Specifically, he was charged with running for the office of town meeting member. It is understood that he was given the opportunity of resigning, but refused on the ground that the Hatch Act does not apply to unpaid volunteer Federal appointees like himself. Furthermore he holds that being a town meeting member is not a political office and therefore in holding such membership he was not participating in politics. Following his refusal to resign he was notified that his term of office on the local rationing board had ceased.

Everyone seems to agree that the Hatch Act has nothing whatever to do with the question at issue, developed in Mr. Lane's refusal to resign. Running for public office such as salaried jobs certainly could be classified as running for a political office. But town meeting members—No. They are elected by ballot, to be sure, but to classify this position in our town government as being a political office is utterly absurd. And whoever has ruled that such an office is political doesn't know what the score is. It's an absurd ruling and one that needs clarifying at once.

Mr. Chairman, immediately after the removal of the chairman of the local rationing board the entire board resigned in protest. The board of selectmen joined in the protest. The town of Weymouth, in town meeting assembled, unanimously adopted a resolution condemning the action of the O. P. A. and calling on Washington officials to review the entire matter immediately. The community seems to be solidly back of the rationing board in its position.

As stated in the editorial, the action taken by the O. P. A. regional director was not taken under the Hatch Act. The Hatch Act as amended specifically exempts a part-time officer without compensation, serving in connection with the existing war effort.

The action was taken by the regional director purely as a matter of policy, designed to restrain all O. P. A. personnel including volunteers from political activities regarded as within the spirit of the Hatch Act, even though the act as amended is not applicable to them. The application of the policy is delegated by the O. P. A. authorities in Washington to regional and district offices.

What is a town meeting member, Mr. Chairman, and what are his duties? Town meeting members in New England are chosen each year in those towns which have become so large that it is impossible for all the townspeople to attend the annual town meeting in person.

The duties of a town meeting member are to attend the annual town meeting normally a year after his election and such special town meetings, if any, as may be necessary in the meantime to deal with strictly local affairs. In the town of Weymouth there are some 249 town meeting members elected as individuals on a non-partisan basis.

The absurdity of the ruling in this instance is emphasized by the fact that the chairman of the rationing board has served for several years both as a member of the board and as a town meeting member, rendering efficient service to the town in both capacities, drawing no compensation from either office and encountering no objection whatsoever heretofore from O. P. A.

If the proposed ruling is to stand, it will, logically apply to all rationing boards throughout Massachusetts and other New England States having town meeting members. If the ruling is to stand, it should logically apply to town meeting members holding positions with selective-service boards and other similar activities.

I am in hearty sympathy with the broad objectives of the Hatch Act. I commend its enforcement.

I believe that the ruling in this instance however, is absurd and without justification. I cannot believe that the duties of a town meeting member bring it in any sense either within the letter or the spirit of the Hatch Act.

I again condemn the action taken by O. P. A., Mr. Chairman. I demand immediate reconsideration, in order that the town of Weymouth, may continue to have the services of its rationing board and that other communities in New England and elsewhere may not be subject to similar action.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include at this point in the RECORD a copy of the editorial referred to, three of the many communications received in this connection, and a copy of a joint letter of protest addressed to O. P. A. Administrator Bowles by members of the Massachusetts delegation.

[From the Weymouth (Mass.) Gazette and Transcript of March 9, 1944]

LANE'S OUSTING STIRS TOWN'S FIGHTING SPIRIT

Never, in our rather lengthy newspaper experience, have we observed such a tidal wave of public resentment as that which developed on Monday, within a few brief hours, over the summary ousting of George E. Lane as chairman of the Weymouth price and rationing board by the regional (Boston) O. P. A. office. And the wave increases in proportion with every passing day.

The O. P. A. regional office threw Mr. Lane out on the grounds that he violated regulations stipulating that rationing board members cannot participate in politics by holding public office. Specifically he was charged with running for the office of town-meeting member. It is understood that he was given the opportunity of resigning, but refused, on the ground that the Hatch Act does not apply to unpaid-volunteer Federal appointees like himself. Furthermore he holds that being a town-meeting member is not a political office and therefore in holding such membership he was not participating in politics. Following his refusal to resign, he was notified that his term of office on the local rationing board had ceased.

When his fellow board members heard this news they were incensed that regional O. P. A. officials could take such a senseless and absurd attitude and they resigned as a body. Their action was in protest to the ousting of their chairman.

Incidentally, it took a good deal of courage on their part to take this action and they are to be complimented in backing their convictions with united action. What they did, not only showed how they feel on the matter at issue, but it is at the same time a personal

tribute to Mr. Lane and one in which he can take pardonable pride. They knew better than anyone else in town what a superb job Mr. Lane has done as a board member since the inception of O. P. A. here in town and particularly as chairman since he succeeded Attorney William J. Holbrook. Their solid backing certainly demonstrated what they thought about the action of the regional O. P. A. office.

This fighting spirit was again displayed a few hours later (early Monday evening), when the selectmen met to consider the resignations of the rationing board members. The selectmen declined to accept the resignations.

Later that evening, at the annual town meeting, J. William O'Donnell, of South Weymouth, rose for the purpose of advising the meeting that Mr. Lane had been "fired" as chairman of the rationing board, and pointed out that the action was taken because Mr. Lane was running for town meeting member in next Monday's town election. He presented a resolution condemning the O. P. A. for its action, and calling upon Washington officials to review the matter at once.

Everyone seems to agree that the Hatch Act has nothing whatever to do with the question at issue, developed in Mr. Lane's refusal to resign. Running for public office such as salaried jobs certainly could be classified as running for a political office. But town meeting members—no. They are elected by ballot to be sure, but to classify this position in our town government as being a political office is utterly absurd. And whoever has ruled that such an office is political, doesn't know what the score is. It's an absurd ruling and one that needs clarifying at once.

If being a town meeting member is something which rationing board members cannot be, at one and the same time, then the same logic must of necessity follow through to selective-service boards. Their members are nonpaid, volunteer workers. They are Federal appointees.

Some of our Weymouth's Selective Service Board's members are also town meeting members. If the same line of reasoning is pursued in relation to them, then they too much resign one position or the other—or be ousted by some \$12,000-a-year understrapper sitting at a polished desk in Boston—or Washington—who has a dwarfed notion of the fitness of things.

This situation, as it relates specifically to Weymouth, must also apply in 37 other towns in this Commonwealth which also have adopted the limited form of town meeting government, like we have here. And there are selective service boards having jurisdiction over all of these towns. When we contemplate a situation like this, with the possibilities it presents for wholesale oustings or resignations, you can begin to see what a tangled mess a stupid decision can create.

Here in Weymouth, Mr. Lane and his fellow rationing board members have the solid backing of the community. He and the others have been deluged with phone calls and messages. In every case, their fellow-townspeople were incensed over the regional O. P. A. raising such a silly issue in the first place, and pledged to support in any way possible, whatever move that might be taken next.

THE TOWN OF WEYMOUTH, MASS.,
East Weymouth, Mass., March 8, 1944.
Representative RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At a meeting of the board of selectmen held this evening it was voted to write to the Office of Price Administration headquarters explaining our predicament in regard to our rationing board, all of whom have resigned, as you may know, in protest of the removal of their chairman, who is a can-

didate for a town meeting member from precinct 8.

We have a situation in Weymouth quite unlike most other towns or cities in Massachusetts or any other State in the Union. We have what is called a representative town meeting consisting of 240 elected members, a certain percent of the voters in each of the 9 precincts. These members are elected from their own precinct and not by vote of the whole town. This type of government was necessary, owing to the large population, approximately 27,000, and no hall suitable to hold such a gathering.

According to the ruling of the Massachusetts Office of Price Administration, the members of our rationing board cannot run for town meeting membership, therefore being deprived of their rights. Neither can we appoint any of the 240 members of the representative town government to the rationing board. In our neighboring towns members of the rationing boards may, and do, attend town meetings, taking an active part in same, but in Weymouth that privilege is denied the membership of the rationing boards. The net result is that we have 10 or more members of the rationing board who cannot take part in our town affairs, and 240 town meeting members, plus other elected officials, that cannot be rationing board members. In our opinion this is not fair to the rationing board members or to the board of selectmen who have to make the recommendations for appointments, especially when your paid officers and employees can take part in their town meetings with no strings attached.

The State officials of the Office of Price Administration inform us that they do not know where they can draw a line. We believe that the State is correct in keeping politics out of the rationing board membership, but we do not consider a town meeting member as being in politics, therefore why not draw the line there and give your rationing board membership the rights that they deserve?

Very truly yours,

MARY J. SHEEHAN,

Clerk, Weymouth Board of Selectmen.

BICKNELL SCHOOL,

North Weymouth, Mass., March 10, 1944.

HON. RICHARD WIGGLESWORTH,

United States Congressman.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: On behalf of the Weymouth Teacher's Association I would like to register their protest concerning the recent action of the Office of Price Administration. This protestation is not for any personal reason but rather a complaint against the fineness of the interpretation of the rule set up in Massachusetts concerning those who aspire to what the Office of Price Administration consider a political office.

We cannot rest with their assumption that a town-meeting member is a political office. It is in our opinion a numerical factor and not a political factor that has forced Weymouth to accept the limited form of town meeting.

Therefore we urge that the necessary steps be taken immediately to correct this injustice in Massachusetts or anywhere else in New England that this might exist and that all members of the dismissed Weymouth board be restored to their former status.

Very truly yours,

E. LEO MADDEN,

President, Weymouth Teachers' Association.

STETSON SHOE CO., RATIONING BOARD,

South Weymouth, Mass., March 7, 1944.

MR. STEPHEN EARLY,

Secretary to the President,

White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: George E. Lane, chairman of the Weymouth War Price and Rationing Board, has been removed by O. P. A.

This removal is based, as we understand it, on the fact that Mr. Lane is desirous of

retaining his status as a town-meeting member* (see explanation attached). That office has been classified by O. P. A. as a "Political" office. It is our further understanding that the entire panel of ration board members has resigned in a body in protest to this ruling.

George Lane was a former selectman of the town of Weymouth and passed up the opportunity to run again for that office, undoubtedly feeling that the time given to the Weymouth War Price Rationing Board would be a substantial contribution to the war effort. Mr. Lane was a candidate for town-meeting member in 1943 and no action was taken by O. P. A. at that time. The fact that he continued as a town-meeting member for the 1944 election has apparently caused this ruling to be made.

We should like to enter our protest against this ruling, for we have felt, as an industrial organization in the town of Weymouth, that the members of the Weymouth War Price and Rationing Board have done good work and that they deserve commendation and not condemnation.

May we respectfully request that everything be done to reinstate as promptly as possible the entire panel of Weymouth War Price and Rationing Board members as a vote of confidence in the work that they have done for their country and their community?

Respectfully yours,

ALBERT VINAL,

Treasurer.

Copies to Hon. DAVID I. WALSH and Hon. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH.

The town of Weymouth, as well as all of the other towns in New England, holds an annual town meeting. In addition to this annual meeting, it sometimes is necessary to hold special (extra) town meetings during the year. Years ago all of the people who wished attended these town meetings, voted the necessary money to run the town and then went home. As the population grew there was no meeting place available which was large enough to hold all of the people who wished to attend. Thus, all who wished could not get inside and vote.

Today, in order to treat every citizen fairly, Weymouth and many other towns, holds its town meetings under what is known as the proportional representation plan.

Thus, a town-meeting member today is one of a body of approximately 249 unpaid citizens chosen by the rest of the citizens to vote for them the appropriations necessary for the operation of the town, in the same manner as all of the citizens did years ago.

Unless special town meetings are necessary these members attend town meeting for either one or two evenings each year. They have no other duties to perform, no other functions, and are not political in the common usage of that term.

MARCH 14, 1944.

HON. CHESTER BOWLES,

Administrator, Office of

Price Administration,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BOWLES: Our attention has been called to the removal of the chairman of the rationing board at Weymouth, Mass., by direction of O. P. A. Regional Director Shoup because of the chairman's decision to run for reelection as a town meeting member, which position he has held for several years, and to the unanimous protest of the town of Weymouth in a town meeting assembled over the action taken.

Those protesting point out that provisions of the Hatch Act have no application to the case inasmuch as by amendment to that act, a member of a war price and rationing board is a part-time officer without compensation, serving in connection with the existing war effort and therefore specifically exempted from the provisions of the act.

They indicate that the action has been taken under the policy of the O. P. A. to refrain from political activities within the spirit of the Hatch Act even though the act as amended is not applicable to them, decision having been delegated by the National O. P. A. Office to regional and district offices.

They believe that the classification of a town meeting member's duties as political duties is without justification and that if adhered to would have wide application to all rationing boards throughout the Commonwealth.

They point out that the duties of a town meeting member, of which we understand there are some 249 in the town of Weymouth, are to attend one town meeting a year after his election and such other special meetings, if any, as may be called in the meantime in respect to strictly local affairs and indicate that in their judgment, those duties can in no sense be classified as political within the letter or spirit of the Hatch Act. They indicate further that in this particular instance, the member in question has served consistently, both as a member of the rationing board and as a town meeting member, giving the town excellent service in both capacities, receiving no compensation in either position and without any objection heretofore on the part of the O. P. A. regional office.

All members of the rationing board resigned in protest over the action taken but have been prevailed upon to withdraw their resignations temporarily pending decision by O. P. A.

We are in hearty sympathy with the broad objectives of the Hatch Act and commend its enforcement, but we feel that the action of the O. P. A. in this instance is outside of the scope of the act. We protest against it and earnestly urge that the matter may be reconsidered with a view to reinstatement of the Weymouth rationing board and assurance of its continued service to the town.

Sincerely yours,

R. B. WIGGLESWORTH, JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., ALLEN T. TREADWAY, EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, PERR G. HOLMES, CHARLES R. CLASON, ANGIER L. GOODWIN, CHRISTIAN A. HERTER.

MR. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

MR. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

THE CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] is recognized for 15 minutes.

MR. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I wish to read an Associated Press quotation of Walter Winchell as follows:

MIAMI BEACH, FLA., March 13.—Walter Winchell said here today that he had been asking various Members of Congress to be investigated for many years. "Dies is the kind of man who does not like any kind of criticism. Some time ago he asked Drew Pearson to please ask Walter Winchell to lay off him. When I told Pearson to tell him to go to hell I expected him to use the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to even matters," Winchell said.

MR. CHAIRMAN, this utterly false statement by Mr. Winchell and the fact that he has demonstrated an unwillingness to find out the truth about a given situation convinces me that he is not concerned with the truth and that he deliberately and intentionally spreads falsehoods over the airways. Last December after Mr. Winchell had used certain false statements repeatedly I wired him and wired the Blue Network advising them that the statements were utterly false. I asked the officials of the Blue Network and Mr. Winchell to meet with me either in

Washington or in New York, that I would permit them to serve as a jury to consider the facts and if they concluded that the evidence was conclusive that the statements used by Mr. Winchell over the air were absolutely and completely false then I expected an opportunity over the same facilities to the same audience to deny those statements. Those wires were sent last December. More than 2½ months elapsed and neither the officials of the Blue Network nor Mr. Winchell saw fit to accord me an opportunity to be heard and to present the facts to them. When we consider their refusal to afford me an opportunity to present the real facts involved, and when Walter Winchell makes a deliberate falsehood to the press it must be obvious to every fairminded citizen that he is not interested in ascertaining the truth.

I wanted to be very careful to find out whether or not he made these misstatements because he did not have the correct information and it was for that reason that I gave to Mr. Winchell and the Blue Network full opportunity to investigate the facts. It happened that most of the evidence was in documentary form and it would not have taken the officials of the broadcasting company and Mr. Winchell more than 30 minutes to acquaint themselves with the facts.

For instance, Mr. Winchell said over the air that our committee had given access to our files to one Joe Camp. I have in my files a letter replying to Joe Camp's request for the information in which I told him that it was the policy of our committee not to permit private individuals to have access to our files and that we would not permit him to see these files. That is only one instance of the falsehoods that Mr. Winchell used over the radio.

Mr. Chairman, since this controversy has arisen I have received thousands of letters from people everywhere who are anxious to appear before our committee to give concrete proof of the deliberate falsehoods that Mr. Winchell has used over the radio. An eminent man in New York who has made a careful survey of all of the Winchell scripts wants to submit proof that only 40 percent of his statements over a period of time are truthful and that 60 percent constitute deliberate falsehoods. Another man in possession of similar evidence is anxious to be heard. I have written to the Blue Network, and said in effect:

Since I have given you every opportunity to demonstrate to the Congress and to the Nation whether or not you are interested in finding out the truth, and since you have declined to avail yourself of the evidence which I am prepared to submit to you, since you are unwilling to act as a jury to pass upon the truth or falsity of these matters it is becoming increasingly apparent to the American people that you are a party to this scheme to malign and smear and discredit American public officials and American citizens as a part of an insidious propaganda program that you are carrying on over the airways of the United States.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. All I know about Winchell is that he is an outstanding American who formerly came from my neighborhood. He was very helpful in the very thing that my distinguished colleague is doing, unearthing un-American activities. I think there must be some misunderstanding, some confusion about his efforts, although I do not know all the facts.

Mr. DIES. Let me answer the gentleman. If I made a statement about the gentleman and repeated that statement and if the gentleman came to me and said, "Now, Mr. DIES, these statements are not correct, I want you to afford me an opportunity to prove this to you conclusively and I will leave it up to your sense of fairness, Mr. DIES, whether or not those statements are true or false," and if I denied that request and then after the gentleman had given me every opportunity to ascertain whether or not I wanted to be fair I were to give to the press of this country a statement as vicious, and insulting, and as indicative of an arrogance which equals, if it does not exceed, Father Coughlin's, what would the gentleman think? Why, Mr. Chairman, when Coughlin was using the airways of this country to spread misunderstandings and promote hatred, leading Catholics were very deeply concerned. I was in communication with some of these Catholic leaders of the Catholic Church. They were as much concerned about that matter as anyone could possibly be, and they exercised their influence to restrict and restrain him and to prevent him from using the airways of this country for the purpose of promoting hatred in the United States.

I regret that there has arisen another man evidently drunk with the praise and the power he thinks he enjoys, who believes he can imitate the methods and technique of Father Coughlin and use the radios of this country for the purpose of spreading deliberate falsehoods.

Mr. Chairman, when Walter Winchell first advertised the book *Secret Army*, Members of Congress called attention to the fact that Spivak, the author of that book, was a member of the Communist Party, and there was a great deal of criticism of Mr. Winchell at that time, but Mr. Winchell then entered into a period in which he came out openly and aboveboard against the Communists. I believed then that Mr. Winchell was prepared to deal fairly and courageously with all of these issues. But he took Sabotage, Mr. DICKSTEIN, a book which was copied to a large extent from the reports of our committee on Japanese and Nazi activities—and there is no question about that—Mr. Winchell gave his endorsement to that book and declared it was one of the finest books ever published in the United States, that every American citizen should read it. In other words, while he did not know it, perhaps, he was endorsing the work of our committee as the finest work that had been accomplished in the history of this country. Then he proceeds to use an excerpt from the book, much of the material of which was stolen from our reports, for the purpose of smearing and

discrediting me and the committee I have the honor to head.

Mr. Chairman, I do not say that Mr. Winchell should not have the right to criticize me as a public official. Long ago I ceased to be sensitive about anything that anybody said about me. I am not contending that we should abridge freedom of speech. I do not propose that the broadcasting companies of this country censor the fair and truthful statements of commentators. What I am trying to say is that when a man uses the airways for the purpose of promoting hatred, whether that hatred is directed against the Jewish people, the Catholic people, or other people in the United States, he is imitating the dangerous technique of Hitlerism, fascism, and all other forms of totalitarianism.

I have analyzed some of his scripts. I wish I had the opportunity to show you the insidious way in which he seeks to create false impressions. I wish I could show you how that method of propaganda is similar in every respect to the method used by Goebbels and the propagandists of Germany. It is inconsistent, Mr. Chairman, for anyone to brand and condemn intolerance, then be guilty of it himself. If we condemn intolerance, we must set an example of tolerance ourselves. It is as wrong to condemn people of one race as it is to condemn people of another race. Yet here is a man who because he is intoxicated with the flattery and applause that greets him at Miami, Fla., has grown so bold that he does not hesitate to tell public officials who have never criticized him, who in all of their statements have been dignified and respectful, "Go to hell." Now that is a fine way to meet an issue.

Mr. Chairman, remember that I did not condemn Mr. Winchell when I spoke the other day. I merely answered the statements that he had made over the radio about me and the committee I serve as chairman. I said nothing that could have reflected upon him; yet with that arrogance, that confident belief that because he has the radio facilities of the country at his disposal, he can use innuendoes, inferences, and falsehoods to destroy public officials and the committees of this Congress. It is a repetition of the Coughlin incident in almost every detail. I want to say to him that bigger men than he have sought to discredit this committee. Smarter and more clever propagandists have sought to smear us, and they have not succeeded. If Mr. Winchell could see the thousands of letters that are pouring into my office, he would realize that he has just gone too far. The people of this country are sick and tired of radio commentators of any stripe who use the airways for the purpose of promoting hatred and spreading falsehoods.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF].

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE TAX BILL

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, it is probable that in the en-

the history of this Nation there has never been a period, long or short, in which more information to which the people are entitled has been denied them than has been the case under the New Deal administration in the last 12 years. There has been no period in the history of our Nation when more misinformation calculated to deceive the people has been disseminated, than has been the case in the last 12 years under the New Deal administration. There has not been a time in the history of our Nation when an organized, cunningly devised, governmentally inspired, politically designed, coolly calculated propaganda has ever been more fully employed to confuse the people, to cover up the facts, to popularize fallacies, and to hide misadministration than in the last 12 years under the New Deal administration.

There has been no period in the history of this Nation when more pseudo emergencies and fake crises have been foisted upon the American people to justify on the part of the Executive demands for power and more power, which could not be justified in fact and in truth, than in the last 12 years under the New Deal administration.

One of the most widespread, unjustified and calculated deceptions practiced on the people has been in regard to the revenue bill which the Congress enacted and which the President vetoed in an insulting and unjustified message to the Congress and which both Houses of the Congress promptly and overwhelmingly passed over the President's veto.

A good deal of the misinformation about this revenue bill has been spread unintentionally by newspapers which fell into the habit of tersely describing the President's demands on the Congress for a ten-and-a-half-billion-dollar-tax bill, and the bill passed by the Congress as a two-billion-dollar-tax bill. There has, however, been a very great deal of cleverly designed propaganda, calculated to cover up the enormous expenditures which are being made, and the enormous tax load which has been placed upon the people, while the internationalists are insisting on giving away what we have to other peoples in the world.

The people should be informed and should keep very clearly in mind the difference—a very fundamental difference, by the way—between military strategy and humane impulse in our feeding the hungry, clothing the naked, and sheltering the homeless in other nations who have been rendered helpless by the war, and the efforts of international adventurers in world-power politics to impoverish the American people by appropriating their substance in the form of machinery and manufactured goods to be used in what is now admittedly a struggle for world power and world domination. These people—these super-internationalists—who are engaged in this desperate game of world-power politics, apparently have neither conscience nor shame. They appear to be willing utterly to impoverish the American people in an effort to buy and bribe acquiescence in their political plots to secure world domination.

Of course, we in America are ready and eager to use bread instead of bul-

lets to secure military cooperation, save human lives, and prevent casualties. The damage which is being done is occurring because these international power adventurers and plotters are utilizing these military and human requirements as a cover for their schemes to make Uncle Sam put up the money for a world-wide W. P. A. unlimited. Some idea of what the American taxpayers will be up against provided these international political power schemers can get away with their designs, can be gained when we realize that the total population of the world is around 2,169,000,000, of whom probably more than one-half, judging by our standards, would fall into the category of ill-fed, ill-clad, and ill-housed.

Added to these outpourings of our substance under lend-lease are the extravagance and the avoidable waste which this administration is permitting in the war effort. The Pentagon Building in Washington is a case in point. Such instances can be multiplied time and time again. There is not the slightest reason in this world why our hard-earned dollars should be squandered in a war effort any more than they should be squandered in peacetime. Certain extravagances and a very great deal of waste are unavoidable in a war effort such as we are engaged in at this time. That is bad enough. But when we have added to that terrible burden of waste and extravagance the deliberate and calculated waste and extravagance of bureaucrats who are determined to wreck the American Government, socialize American industry, make serfs and peons of American farmers, and keep the people in subjection to bureaucratic regimentation after the war ends, it is time the American people were told the facts so they can do something about such an outrageous state of affairs.

Apparently it is for the purpose of hiding these designs, the waste, the extravagance, the corruption, which are rampant in the executive branch of the Government today, that the propagandists and the New Deal press keep spreading the impression that the President asked for ten and a half billion dollars in taxes and that the Congress gave him only a \$2,000,000,000 tax bill.

In my years of service on the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, I have become acutely conscious of the terrible tax burden which has been growing by leaps and bounds under this New Deal administration. The bureaucrats, sensing that the people are getting fed up with excuses, broken promises, visionary schemes, alien ideologies, and political waste and corruption, have begun to exert every effort to cover up and conceal from the knowledge of the people the tremendous sums of money which are being taken from the pockets of the citizens by taxation both visible and hidden.

This is the picture which lies behind this general impression being thrust upon the Nation, in terms of ten billions and two billions as representing the tax bill, instead of the real amount. I now shall tell you the facts. They are as follows: The estimated revenue of the Federal Government from all sources for 1943 was \$42,500,000,000. With the \$2,-

300,000,000 of added revenue which the Congress passed over the President's veto in the last revenue bill, the estimated revenue for 1945 would stand at \$44,800,000,000. What the President was asking for was not a tax revenue of \$10,500,000,000, but additional tax revenues of that amount to be imposed upon the \$42,500,000,000 of revenue already assessed against our people. This, if the Congress had been bludgeoned into passing it, would have run the Government's revenues for 1945 to \$53,000,000,000.

Every citizen knows when he stops to think about it that all taxation in the end is and must be paid by the man or woman who buys things across the counter. All this New Deal talk about making the rich pay the proposed additional taxes is just so much political "bunk." Big incomes, corporate revenues, are now taxed to the utmost. The fact is that an income of \$500,000 a year in the State of New York, one of the States having a State income-tax law, would leave the individual receiving it in debt when he had paid his Federal taxes and his State tax, the total amount of which would be more than his total taxable income. Any individual having a million-dollar income in the State of New York would be deeper in debt than the possessor of a \$500,000 income, after his Federal and State taxes were paid. Even in the States having no State income-tax law, no taxpayer, regardless of the size of his taxable income during this year and next, can have left after paying his taxes, a sum greater than \$24,261.76. In other words, we have already reached a point of practical confiscation of all big incomes. So, when Mr. Roosevelt proposes to take an additional \$10,500,000,000 in revenues out of the American people, he is proposing to take it out of the pockets of the poor people to a very great extent, and of those with smaller incomes, because that is the only place additional revenue can be secured to finance the waste and extravagance of the huge political bureaucracy which this administration has built up to bestride the shoulders of the taxpayers like an "Old man of the sea." The protestations of the administration, especially those of the Treasury Department, under Mr. Morgenthau, that they are trying to protect the poor people from this load of taxation is intentionally deceptive, and entirely erroneous, and one of the best authorities I can pick out at this moment for that statement is Franklin Delano Roosevelt himself when, in 1932, he said:

Taxes are paid in the sweat of the man who labors, because they are a burden on production and are paid through production.

Mr. Roosevelt, when he made that statement, was running for the office he still holds. That was before he had run our national debt from \$19,500,000,000, when he took office, up to about \$49,000,000,000 before we entered the war. No citizen can tell now what the national debt is, because it increases so enormously from day to day that he cannot keep track of it, and the Treasury avoids talking about it.

Mr. Roosevelt was not the first man, by any means, who discovered that waste means taxes, and taxes mean misery for

the people. Thomas Jefferson, in his day, pointed out the dangers of excessive waste and the consequent excessive taxation when he said:

Having seen the people of all other nations bowed down to the earth under the wars and prodigalities of their rulers, I have cherished their opposite—peace, economy, and ridance of public debt—believing that these were the high roads to public as well as private prosperity and happiness. * * * Taxation follows public debt, and in its train wretchedness and oppression. * * * If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labors of the people under the pretense of taking care of them they must become happy. * * * The same prudence, which, in private life, would forbid our paying our money for unexplained projects forbids it in the disposition of the public money. * * * We must make our election between economy and liberty or profusion and servitude.

Let us stop a moment and ponder the hundreds of millions of your money squandered on the Canol pipe-line project in British Columbia; the Pentagon Building project in Virginia, adjacent to Washington, so ably exposed in its terribly wasteful ramifications by my good friend the gentleman from Michigan, Representative ALBERT J. ENGEL; the Alaska Highway, and the proposed oil pipe lines in Saudi Arabia. Ponder these along with the extravagances under cover of lend-lease, and the plans of the world-power politicians to take your substance—your goods and services—away from you, to bribe other people into acquiescence with the plans of these power politicians lusting for world domination—these men and women who would put their own people and all the other peoples of the world in economic slavery in order that their own passion for power may be gratified.

And then remember, my fellow citizens, that Mr. Roosevelt was demanding not a ten-and-a-half-billion tax burden of you, but a fifty-three billion tax burden of you. And remember, too, that it was your Congress, your representatives in the legislative body, who stood between you and that extravagant and extortionate demand and whittled these new raids on your pocketbook from ten and a half billion dollars down to two and a third billions.

MR. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

ALASKA, ELK HILLS, AND ARABIA

MR. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, this is another speech about oil.

First, I want to express profound satisfaction over articles recently appearing in the press and other information which I have received to the effect that at long last real exploration is to be undertaken in the oil resources of Alaska. The Navy is dispatching a party of experts to the vicinity of Point Barrow at Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4. In the near future it is reported that the War Department will undertake investigation of fields in Southern Alaska.

I do not know how much oil there is in Alaska, Mr. Chairman. But there are those who believe there is a very great quantity indeed and certainly there is every reason why Congress should do

everything within its power to encourage and facilitate the exploration of our own American resources in Alaska. Indeed my only regret is, it was not done long ago. For I think there is at least the possibility that had we found out accurately what Alaskan resources actually are some other mistakes and blunders might have been avoided. We might readily have avoided the mistakes of the Canol project, which understandable though it may have been in the beginning as a military measure, should certainly have been carried out in a very different manner and which as presently set up can only result in the long run in great benefits to the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, through its 70 percent owned subsidiary Imperial Oil, Ltd., at American taxpayers' expense. For since Imperial holds all the leases, only Imperial can use the pipe line in the future. How much better it would have been had these Alaskan fields been developed instead with the whole project on American soil all the way through.

I wish I could continue on this constructive note, but I cannot. For on yesterday there was introduced in the other body of Congress, a bill to permit the Secretary of the Navy to enter into unit operations contracts with private oil companies for the exploitation of naval reserves. The purpose of this bill, of course, is to legalize the contract between the Navy and the Standard Oil Co. for the operation of Elk Hills Naval Reserve. Should this bill pass it will mean that not only that portion of the Elk Hills field where Standard owns sections of land checkerboarded with Navy sections, but also the entire western and southern portion of the field where the Navy owns the entire acreage will be thrown into a unit operations plan constituting a partnership in the exploitation of this oil between the Navy on the one hand and the Standard Oil Co. on the other.

It will be recalled that a year ago last November the first contract between Navy and Standard Oil Co. was quietly put into effect and continued in operation until last summer when as a result of congressional efforts on the part of other Members and myself, as well as the action of the Justice Department through its Lands Division, in declaring the contract illegal, that first contract was canceled. Something at least has been accomplished by our efforts for some of the worst features of the original contract do not appear in the new proposed contract. But the Attorney General has stated that this new contract would not be valid unless the basic law is changed. Congress, therefore, has this question squarely in its own lap as I see it, and will have to decide whether or not it wants to empower the Secretary of the Navy to go into partnership with the Standard Oil Co., giving it operation of the greatest oil reserve in the Western Hemisphere or not. I know it will be said that under the terms of the proposed new contract the Navy is free to deal with some other company than Standard if it sees fit to do so, but to anyone who is at all familiar with the actual situation in the Elk Hills areas, it will be clear that this is a meaningless

provision. The Standard Oil Co. of California owns all the pipe lines leading from Elk Hills, and under the California law these pipe lines are not common carriers. When the contract states that either party can dispose of its oil as it sees fit, therefore it virtually means that the Navy can either sell its oil to the Standard Oil Co. or else attempt to carry it out in buckets. This contract, furthermore, contemplates passage of this bill changing our whole policy and authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to enter into unit-operations-plan contracts, not only at Elk Hills but elsewhere as he sees fit.

I still believe, Mr. Chairman, as I have from the beginning, that the only right solution of this problem is by condemnation by the Navy of the Standard holdings in Elk Hills. That is the only way, in my judgment, that on any reasonable basis at all, Elk Hills can be made a true Navy reserve. At this very moment some of the very same people who are shouting that our oil resources are dangerously near exhaustion are complaining very loudly, indeed, because the Navy will not permit the Standard Oil Co. to pump more oil out of Elk Hills than it is now permitted to do. This is urged in spite of the fact that it is well known that an increase of the amount of oil taken by Standard from Elk Hills will inevitably deplete the oil under the Navy's land even more seriously than has already taken place by the drilling operations of Standard along the Navy section lines. I am opposed to this unit-operations plan because I am convinced it will immeasurably strengthen the monopolistic position which the Standard Oil Co. already holds. Five hundred and eighty thousand acres of California's potential or proven oil land is now either owned in fee, under lease, or with mineral rights, held by the Standard Oil Co. For years Standard has virtually controlled the price of crude oil in California and will be in an even better position to do so if it gains control of the Navy's Elk Hills field.

I want to ask the question as to just why the whole of the Elk Hills field is included in the unit plan of operation. It is clear from the map that only in the eastern and northern portions of the field does the checkerboard-ownership situation pertain. Through the southern portion and the entire western half of the field Standard owns only one or two quarter sections, and yet it is proposed, without our knowing with any degree of accuracy what lies underneath the rest of the field, to draw this whole business into the unit-operations plan with an oil company, which in the physical nature of the case can only be the Standard Oil Co. of California. Were Standard's holding condemned and purchased by the Navy, the Standard Oil Co. would still be able to get along quite well. But our Navy's oil could then be definitely produced and handled in whatever manner it was best to handle it from the national point of view. If this contract proposed to include only those portions of the Elk Hills field where Standard does own part of the land, I would not feel quite so strongly about the matter. But as I see the present proposal, it

boils down to one which would without any reason or necessity give the Standard Oil Co. a very greatly increased control of the oil of the United States.

Now, I am quite frank to say that the new contract is much better than the original one was, and if nothing else had been accomplished by our efforts, we would have at least the right to feel a certain satisfaction over the results so far obtained. For under the new contract, although the original participating percentages of 64 percent for Navy and 36 percent for Standard are still included, nevertheless it is provided that changes in participating percentages will be retroactive to November 1942. Under the old contract these changes would not have been so retroactive and to whatever extent oil was discovered on Navy lands, which is about the only place it can be discovered since Standard lands have already been pretty heavily exploited, Standard would still have retained any excess oil over its fair percentage which it has taken. As I say, in this contract that feature has been corrected, and, as a matter of fact, it is altogether likely that long before Elk Hills has stopped producing it will be found that well in excess of 64 percent of the oil will come from Navy lands.

In the second place, the new contract does make the Secretary of the Navy the final arbiter, which he was not under the old agreement, as to changes in these percentages of participation. Even so, however, the United States is starting out at a great disadvantage, for the percentages are based on the area of commercial production which is defined on the map. This area of commercial production includes only about 9,000 acres out of a total of 42,000 acres in the whole Elk Hills field. The area includes those sections belonging to Standard Oil Co. in which the encroachment of water has become a serious problem. Most important of all, however, the western line of this so-called area of commercial production is, as anyone can see, a completely arbitrary one, for it is nothing more or less than a section line. Any one man knows that oil is no respecter of section lines. Furthermore, this western line of the so-called area of commercial production is the west line of section 36 on which already a number of successful wells have been drilled and the land to the west of that line belongs to the Navy. It is almost certain that there is additional oil west of the line which would materially change percentages if the line were made to accord with the real facts of the situation instead of arbitrary section lines.

The very fact that so much stress is laid upon the matter of revision of the participating percentages is proof that no one knows adequately what the facts are, and even though these percentages are subject to revision, or rather, I should say, because they are subject to revision, we are running into a situation where it will be required, as I see it, to have as large an accounting staff and staff of lawyers as was ever had in the history of the oil business, or in any other business, for any readjustments made in participating percentages must be made ret-

roactive, as they should be, to November 1942. This means constant readjustments all along the line. It will probably mean constant litigation. It will require every time a change is made that the whole system of accounts will have to be altered.

In the next place, it is to be remembered that the oil company involved in this unit agreement is to be paid its costs of operation out of the Navy's share of the oil. Originally those costs will be shared on a 64-36 basis. They are to be settled periodically and in the end there must be a readjustment of the allocation of these costs in accordance with the division of participation in the oil. It will be virtually impossible, as I see it, to ever get these costs in balance. All these difficulties can be multiplied by at least two when I point out that there are at least two zones, namely, the shallow zone and the so-called Stevens zone, where it is known that oil exists in Elk Hills. It will be virtually impossible to find out where the Navy stands in this matter under the unit-operations plan at any given time.

I want to emphasize that the services of the oil company may be paid either in oil or in money. If they are paid in oil no appropriation will be necessary on the part of Congress, and, therefore, no check by Congress on the operations of the deal will be possible. I have not tried to go into any technical detail, Mr. Chairman. I am for condemnation and not for the unit-operations plan, first, because under the unit-operations plan the monopolistic control of the Standard Oil Co. will be immeasurably enhanced by governmental action; second, because at the very least I believe those portions of the Elk Hills reserve which are wholly owned by the Navy should be left wholly in the Navy's hands and should not be subjected to this unit-operations proposal; third, because of the terrific complications involved in attempting to even come close to telling where the Government stands with regard to the matter at any given time; fourth, because of the present outcry that the Navy release its restrictions on production at Elk Hills in order to let Standard pump more oil from there. This sort of thing would, in my judgment, continue just as long as this oil was being made available to a private corporation; and finally, because I do not believe there is any other way except condemnation whereby we can have a true reserve for naval oil at Elk Hills. I believe there are manifold reasons why it is a matter of the greatest importance that we should make this a true Navy reserve.

I now come to the proposed deal for construction of a pipe line across Arabia at Government expense, but without any sort of governmental control over the oil or over the policies to be pursued in its disposition. It is interesting I think that the same oil company which is so anxious to get into partnership with the Navy with regard to the Navy's rich Elk Hills reserve, has consistently refused to permit the Government to purchase any interest in its Saudi Arabia leases. Everything appears to depend upon which foot the shoe is on. I have spoken against

this pipe-line agreement for a number of reasons. It has been defended on only one ground, and that is the allegation that it is a war measure and one of military necessity. This, I contend once again, it cannot conceivably be—at least so far as the present war is concerned. For it will take as long to build the pipe line as anyone believes this war is going to last. Then they fall back on the argument that it is supposed to be for the next war. To which my reply is that under the present proposed agreement it appears to me that in attempting to get oil clear on the other side of the world in order to have it for "the next war" that these gentlemen are talking about so much, we are altogether likely to be at the same time putting ourselves in a position where we will be forced into that next war for which we are supposed to need this oil. In other words, instead of an investment in national security, it looks to me like an investment in national insecurity.

As I have explained in a former speech, my position is that either the Government should have nothing whatsoever to do with the construction of this pipe line, or else it should insist as it did insist in the beginning of negotiations that if it is to assume all the risk and get itself involved in all the dangers of an international sort which will inevitably result, it should then be in a position of having a substantial interest in the oil itself and of being able to exercise control over the policies to be pursued in order to prevent this oil falling into the hands of a huge international cartel, which in the absence of the United States Government opposition, is, I believe, quite inevitable.

I have believed from the beginning, Mr. Chairman, and I believe now, that it is utterly impossible to consider this Arabian pipe line without taking into account those features of the situation which it will create which have so vital a bearing on future peace and the security of our own Nation, as well as other parts of the world.

This is a job for the State Department, and I have made an earnest effort to secure information from the State Department about the matter. This effort was completely without success. Mr. Raynor, the petroleum adviser of the State Department, gave me absolutely no real information about the matter and simply told me that he approved the deal for the State Department without independent consideration or study on the part of the State Department and only because the President and the Joint Chiefs of Staff were insisting upon it as a military measure. I cannot conceive of the State Department, which is the Department of government that has responsibility for the foreign affairs of our country, permitting a thing of this sort to go through without insisting upon taking into account its implications bearing on the future international relations of the United States. And yet I am informed that that is precisely what happened. Not only that, but I was dealt with in a manner far from straightforward, an experience which has deepened and strengthened my suspicions about this whole affair.

The State Department did have a representative who went to Arabia to look over this project. He did make a report on it. I asked to see this man and was told at first that he was out of town. I now find this was not true; that he was in Washington at the time I was told he was not in Washington. Further, I was informed that this report was only a technical report dealing with the amount of oil that might be developed in the Arabian area. I subsequently find, however, that this is not true, either, but that the report does deal with the proposed pipe-line agreement, and, furthermore, that it is adverse to the agreement in its present form. I am compelled to conclude that this must have been one of the reasons Mr. Raynor refused to let me see the report. I am also informed on authority which I consider absolutely reliable that the report tendered to the War Department by its representative who went to the Middle East was also adverse to the terms of the present pipe-line construction agreement. I should certainly think some congressional body should find out about all this—and at once. For this pipe line is going forward just as fast as it can be pushed right at this moment.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is a matter where at the very least Congress is going to appropriate several hundred millions of dollars not only for the pipe line but for the necessary additional construction of a refinery, without which the pipe line can hardly be of much use. More than that it is a matter which may well have a vital bearing on the world peace which every last one of us is promising the fighting men of our country will be built after victory has been achieved.

Some weeks ago I introduced a resolution for a thorough investigation of all facts concerning the petroleum industry by a special House committee selected from the Military and Naval Affairs Committees, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the Public Lands Committee, and the Agriculture Committee. If I am wrong about this matter, I am the first man who wants to know it. But the only way to find out is for a congressional committee to get all the facts regarding the matter, including reports made by men who have been actually on the ground and who know intimately the problems involved.

Members of Congress frequently express concern over domination of this body by the executive department. We become so extremely agitated when the President sends up a message to the Congress which is couched in terms which we do not like. On a number of occasions Presidential vetoes have been overridden. But here are matters connected with what is perhaps at the moment the basic natural resource of the Nation with regard to which Congress will either have to take a positive direct action of its own, insisting upon a decent coordinated policy calculated to build peace in the world in the future and to construct the security of our country on a really firm foundation, or else share the responsibility for whatever the consequence may be of things that are now being done.

Mr. Chairman, let us explore and develop our oil resources in Alaska as it is now planned to do. Let us free the independents in the oil industry from the domination of the majors. Let us conserve the oil in our naval reserves by making them in truth and in fact naval reserves and by condemning private holdings in those reserves. But let us insist that if ventures on the other side of the earth after oil are to be undertaken, they be undertaken on the terms of the American people and only in a manner which will promote the future peace and security of the American people, instead of leading them into a situation where they will be committed to huge international oil cartels and the very sort of practices in the handling of natural resources which the Atlantic Charter declared against.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, last year the subcommittee that prepared the pending bill graciously afforded me an opportunity to testify in behalf of an additional appropriation for the Legislative Reference Service in the Library of Congress. I had no opportunity to avail myself of the grace of the subcommittee this year and since the matter is closed, I do not propose to offer any amendment. I do want to allude to the matter, because I believe it is quite imperative and important. It has some bearing upon the recent unpleasantness in the legislative and executive branches of the Government. It appears to me that in proportion as we make our own operation in the legislative branch more efficacious, we can always meet the administrative agencies on their own ground weaponed with necessary facts and figures and try to develop a better cooperative relationship between the two branches of government.

After all, the Constitution, while it contemplates three independent branches, does not contemplate three hostile branches of government. So the Congress must take its place in the sun and be adequately equipped. One of the weapons or instrumentalities which I think needs strengthening is the Legislative Reference Service. At the present time it consists of 66 people, of whom only 16 are specialists. Imagine, only 15 specialists in that agency of government that is under the direction and control of Congress, serving the requirements and needs of 531 Members of the House and Senate. They are inadequately compensated. The man who does work for Congress in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress on monetary matters, as I recall, on banking and fiscal matters, receives \$2,600 a year. He is expected to be a fiscal expert for \$2,600 a year. There are more than 40 experts in the Treasury and in the Federal Reserve Board who are receiving from \$5,600 to \$8,000 a year. The same thing is true in the field of social security and labor. In those appropriate executive agencies they have scores of men drawing \$4,200, \$4,600, \$5,400, \$5,600, \$6,500 and even

\$8,000 a year, who are specialist-advisers in that particular field of governmental activity. Yet over in the Library of Congress are men serving this body today, ostensibly as experts, who are working for as little as \$2,600 a year. How do we expect to command specialists in an expert service at salaries of that kind? I think men in the older age brackets who are not amenable to the requirements of selective service would be available for that kind of work, especially in this period when we are preparing already to begin the transition from hostilities to peace, when so much is necessary from this Congress by way of appropriations, authorizing legislation, and commitments in order to deal with the manifold problems which will be on the threshold of this body in the future. So we must be weaponed and equipped for it. One of the best things we can do to serve the taxpayers and serve the general welfare of the country is to take unto ourselves those aids and instrumentalities whereby we get the facts, whereby we get an unbiased and impartial view of every question that will be a great guide and a great directive in finding the right answers to the problems that are before us. I shall not offer that amendment today. I want to make the record here now in the hope that when the bill goes over before the Senate that perhaps they will give some attention to it also.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, last week I was in Wisconsin at the annual meeting of the livestock breeders of that State. The food-production program is marching on. There is a patriotic desire to produce the food for this war. It appears that they will continue to exert every energy they have to produce this food even if unnecessary obstacles are placed in their pathway by Washington.

One fact was very apparent. That is that the promises of the War Food Administration were being questioned. The promises to the dairy farmer, the egg producer, the hog producer, and now the potato grower have not been sufficiently well carried out to meet their approval. The programs of the A. A. A. and the Extension Service workers and other agencies is made less effective due to the fact that the commitments to producers have not been sufficiently well fulfilled. There isn't much use to pour funds into any program where the commitment is not carried out. They are in hopes that the LaFollette amendment to the act extending the life of the C. C. C. will remedy this situation. They cannot see, however, why it should be necessary to pass a law to make any individual or agency to carry out the provisions of law already a part of the law of the land.

I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks at this point in the Record, the address I made at the livestock meeting at the agricultural college on March 8, heretofore referred to.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The address is as follows:

It is indeed a pleasure for me to have the opportunity of meeting so many old friends and also to meet so many people who are so vitally interested in wartime agriculture.

Wartime agriculture has met an unprecedented demand for food for our armed forces, lend-lease, and for our domestic population. This demand has been made in the face of machinery shortages, equipment shortages, restricted transportation, and ever-increasing manpower shortages. Our armed forces are the best-fed of any army in the war, and our food products have not only gone to the armed forces of our allies but in large amounts have been distributed to the civilians as well.

The results have spoken for themselves. The patriotic desire to produce has resulted in a national food production during 1942 and 1943 that is comparable to the industrial production of the implements of war that American labor and management have made during this same period.

During these 2 years of war we have had an increase in total cattle from 75,000,000 on January 1, 1942, to an estimated 82,000,000 on January 1, 1944. Dairy cows have increased from 26,398,000 to 27,607,000, although the increase in cow numbers has not given a comparable increase in milk production. In fact, in 1943 with a half million more cows we produced over a billion pounds less milk than in 1942.

Hogs have increased from 60,000,000 to 83,000,000, or over one-third; chickens have increased from 474,000,000 to 572,000,000 during these same 2 years. Sheep have decreased in number from 56,000,000 to 51,000,000 for reasons I shall discuss later.

It is unnecessary for me to remind you of the contribution made by Wisconsin to the national production of livestock products and food crops during this period.

THE OVER-ALL PICTURE

We have some 500,000,000 acres of cropland in the United States, although only about 340,000,000 acres are usually harvested. Many of these idle acres are marginal but will raise crops such as beans, that are now rationed. The past 2 years have been years of above-normal weather conditions and the Food Administrator has asked for an increase in crop acreage in 1944 in the hopes of obtaining even the 1943 total production of food products.

Did you ever stop to consider where the great food-producing areas of our country really are located? Many States do not produce enough food to provide their own population. Much of our agricultural leadership has come during the past 10 years from States that produce a very small part of the Nation's food products. We wouldn't, otherwise, have had an agricultural program appropriation of \$400,000,000 to \$800,000,000 a year, wherein a soil-conservation program was for years carried on where the payments went largely to soil-depleting crops. This situation was a result of the leadership and of the legislation and should not be interpreted as critical of the men who had the responsibility of administering it. They followed the provisions of the legislation and they should not be criticized for the legislation. The incentive payment and Cannon amendment controversy of the last session of Congress is a concrete example.

Chicago is the food capital of the world—and a comparatively few States surrounding this city produce a very high percentage of the food of the Nation. These States include: Iowa, Minnesota, Ohio, Indiana, Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska, and Wisconsin.

Iowa and Illinois produce one-third of the corn and one-third of the pork of the Nation. Minnesota, Iowa, and Wisconsin produce over 40 percent of the butter, and Wisconsin alone, as you well know, produces over half of the Cheddar cheese and a higher percentage of the foreign types of cheese of the Nation.

Although Wisconsin produces 12 percent of the milk of the Nation it produced in 1942, 13,000,000,000 of the 98,000,000,000 pounds of milk that went into commercial dairy channels. In fact, in 1942 Wisconsin alone produced more milk than all of New England with New York and New Jersey included.

The February 1944 price for milk ranged from \$2.60 per hundredweight in North Dakota to \$4.75 per hundredweight in Florida, with Iowa receiving \$2.65, Minnesota \$2.70, and Wisconsin \$2.75 per hundredweight. The new feed subsidy ranges from 50 cents per hundredweight in the largest milk-producing States like Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Iowa to 80 cents in Florida, Georgia, and South Carolina, where milk in Florida is already bringing over 75 percent more than in the Midwest. This situation is not as serious as it sounds because these Southern States produce such small amounts of the milk of the Nation.

During wartime with controls on new equipment and transportation, the transforming of the raw materials of the farm into commercial food products should of necessity be increased and fostered in the States and counties in the areas already engaged in the particular branch of farming that had been previously practiced in these areas. Greater effort could well have been expended and now expended to increase the production of milk in the natural milk areas instead of fostering a high subsidy program in areas with high production costs.

Some expansion of products such as peanuts in the Cotton Belt and the hemp and soybean growing in the Midwest have for other and logical reasons not been in keeping with this general plan.

THE BEEF SITUATION

I am sure you have followed the beef situation, especially when 40 percent of the beef and veal comes from the dairy farms. The stated purpose of the beef program is to produce as much good meat as possible but not give a price sufficiently high to encourage the production of the choice meats of peacetime. It would take more than the time allotted me here today to even get started on a discussion of this subject. Beef-cattle numbers have been expanding, but when one realizes that we have been on an import basis as far as beef is concerned for 30 years, I am sure you can see how tight the beef situation could be if any appreciable increase in demands should take place, or if a reduction in the production of beef should confront us.

On February 15, 1944, the price of beef cattle varied from \$8.50 per hundredweight in Vermont to \$12.60 per hundredweight in Pennsylvania, with an average price of \$10.10 per hundredweight in Wisconsin, and a national average of \$11.80. The February 1944 parity price is \$9.20. The fairness of the beef parity, as you know, has always been questioned.

THE HOG SITUATION

When Secretary Wickard, in April 1942, asked for the increase in hogs and put the floor of \$13.75 Chicago basis on them he obtained a great response in production. War legislation guaranteed farmers 90 percent of parity during the war and 2 years thereafter. This has its legislative controls, however. Support prices like the support prices on the hogs weighing from 200 to 240 to 270 to 300 to 330 had nothing to do with the 90-percent parity guaranty. However, recently when the Commodity Credit Corporation Act was extended Senator LA FOLLETTE added an amendment that provides that this 90-per-

cent parity promised the producer be paid and that all commitments to producers be fulfilled without fail.

Most people could never see any reason to ration pork, especially since December 1, 1943. A few months ago 128,000,000 pounds of lard were turned over to the soap manufacturers for soap making. Within the last few days another 50,000,000 pounds have been allocated to these soap manufacturers. This was done at a time that the housewife was paying points for lard, but these were removed on March 1.

The importance of pork production is known to everyone that has interest enough to study the situation. The hog is a very efficient animal in the conversion of feeds to human food when both calories and proteins are considered. No one has yet found out why it was more patriotic to eat chicken than pork.

Hog prices in February 1944 varied from \$10 per hundredweight in Florida and \$10.20 per hundredweight in Mississippi to \$14.10 per hundredweight in California. The average for Wisconsin was \$12.80 and the parity price of February is \$12.40 per hundredweight.

THE EGG SITUATION

The parity price of eggs was 35 cents for the year 1943. The parity price of eggs was 44 cents in December 1943, and 90 percent of parity guaranteed by law was 39.6 cents per dozen, when the farmers in many sections were receiving from 24 to 28 to 30 cents per dozen right in the face of advancing feed prices. The LaFollette amendment should guarantee that commitments in the future are fulfilled so that such occurrences cannot be repeated.

Egg prices in February 1944 varied from 28 cents a dozen in North Dakota, 41 cents per dozen in Arizona, with Wisconsin showing an average of 30 cents per dozen. The national average price for February was 31.9 cents per dozen and the parity price for the month is practically the same, or 31.8 cents per dozen.

THE DAIRY SITUATION

The attack on this industry during wartime has been from many angles. The oleomargarine interests put their demands for a removal of the one-fourth-cent-per-pound tax, the 10-cent coloring tax, and the licensing on the basis of war needs. This was soon shown a fallacious approach because the facts were that all the oleomargarine was being made for which the War Production Board had allocated the oil. The oleomargarine interests are still on hand to try to find some way to promote their wares. They claim they have a new and much better product now. They even want to change its sex. They used to call it Ole and now they want one to call it Margy. The oleomargarine tax plus Federal licensing brings in around \$2,000,000 a year to the United States Treasury. Vegetable-oil and cottonseed-oil processors are being subsidized for somewhere between forty and fifty million dollars in 1943 and the subsidy on vegetable oils is estimated at \$65,000,000 in 1944. Between two and one-half and three billion pounds of vegetable oil is being subsidized, so you can see that the vegetable oils in the oleomargarine are being subsidized more per pound than the Federal taxes on the product. The subsidy may be twice the tax collections.

The filled-milk makers obtained 6,700 tons of tin and steel for their concoction in 2 years when it was next to impossible to get enough tin to line a vat in a corner cheese factory. The product is not rationed. Incidentally, this filled milk sells for 9 cents per can, and three cans of natural evaporated milk can be bought even in Washington for 26 cents. When the butterfat is removed and sold as cream, which is not rationed, at 75 cents to \$1 per pound, and when cottonseed oil, which is subsidized and has a 13-cents-per-pound O. P. A. ceiling, is squirted

in the can to replace the butterfat, do you really think this is being done to help the war effort? This filled milk is the hand-maiden of oleo. All these synthetic dairy products belong in the same class. The oleo is to the butter producer what the filled milk is to evaporated milk and whole-milk industry and what synthetic cheese is to the cheese industry.

Creamola is a new one. They take unrationed cream and mix it with vegetable oil and sell it unrationed. There are other "gyp" set-ups in food products springing up during wartime. Also among these are the low-fat and high-moisture cheeses.

THE WOOL SITUATION

One of the perplexing problems of the present day is the embarrassment of the wool accumulations in our country. Most people agree it would be both more perplexing and embarrassing if it were a shortage instead of an abundance.

At the time of Pearl Harbor no one knew exactly what the shipping situation really would be. We were accumulating stock piles of many strategic materials of war at that time. We produce in the United States around four hundred to four hundred and fifty million pounds of wool per year. We have a peacetime consumption of some 600,000,000 pounds. In early 1942 some military leaders expected to see a Japanese attack on Australia. England moved 400,000,000 pounds of its own wool into the warehouses of the United States. This is supposed to be in bond.

It appears that our Defense Plant Corporation advanced the freight and other charges and holds the warehouse receipts on this wool. In addition, the Defense Plant Corporation purchased outright some 300,000,000 pounds of wool. In addition to the purchases of this national agency, individual dealers and manufacturers during 1943 alone imported some 500,000,000 pounds. The Commodity Credit Corporation purchased the 1943 United States clip of 450,000,000 pounds and the estimated 1944 clip is about the same, or 450,000,000 pounds.

Adding the 400,000,000 pounds of British wool in bond, the Defense Plant Corporation storage stock of 300,000,000, the 900,000,000 1943 and 1944 clip, and the accumulations as a result of the imports of domestic individuals and manufacturers on a 500,000,000 annual import basis, one can visualize a billion-pound wool stock pile. Wartime demands may take 800,000,000 to 900,000,000 pounds annually. This situation has no doubt resulted in a weakening of the sheep position in the United States. It may have been a contributing factor to the reduction of sheep numbers from January 1, 1942, to January 1, 1944, of some 5,000,000, or from 56,000,000 to 51,000,000.

The foreign wool can be bought in Australia, have the duty added onto it, and still be purchased under the United States fixed price.

The Agricultural Committee had hearings on the problem and it is hoped that some workable plan will be evolved without too much hardship. To date the recommendations have been: (1) That one agency deal with the situation and be responsible for disposing of the stock pile in as orderly manner as is possible; (2) to use some of the stock pile in lend-lease; (3) use of this wool stock pile through United Nations relief and rehabilitation, and furnish goods in lieu of cash where feasible; (4) by licensing imports in the future; and (5) by making an acceptable agreement as to the amounts imported on an import quota basis the same as we have on wheat.

The February 1944 farm price of wool varied from 33 cents a pound in Oklahoma to 48 cents a pound in Virginia, Maryland, and Delaware, with Wisconsin receiving 42 cents per pound. The February parity price is the

same as the price received by farmers on a national average. In February 1944 it was 39½ cents per pound.

From the above one can see the problems in regard to price adjustments. We need a constructive approach rather than a destructive criticism in meeting many of these problems. Another example, Oklahoma in 1943 received 34 cents a pound for its wool, while Virginia received 50 percent more, or 51 cents a pound. It is apparent that adjustment for one of these States may not be satisfactory to the producers in the other States. Many factors must be taken into consideration in connection with all agricultural commodities in order to arrive at and follow a constructive approach in our efforts to make the best contribution to the war-food program.

SUBSIDIES

Wartime agriculture could not be considered without a few remarks about subsidies. From 1925 to 1940, regardless of party, there were plans put in operation to lift or raise agricultural prices. Many devices were put into effect. However, in 1939, after these many years of adjustments, we had wheat at 54 cents, 5-cent hogs, 6 months of 11-cent cheese and other prices that were not fixed, correspondingly low. Wisconsin in 1939 had the largest number and the highest percentage of foreclosures ever foreclosed in the history of the Federal land bank.

Now we have a program to hold prices down. It was difficult to raise these prices, as you well know, and it has been difficult and will continue to be difficult to hold prices down and still obtain high production totals. One fact is disturbing as well as confusing. It is, How can administration spokesmen advocate roll-back food subsidies in the face of the highest individual and national incomes in our history? If agricultural parity is worth consideration in any sense of the word how can administration spokesmen publicly admit that our citizens cannot pay their grocery bills when food prices are parity or the goal?

Since this subsidy issue has been under consideration for a year, it would take hours to discuss it from all angles. First of all, it isn't a question of subsidy or no subsidy. No responsible voice has been raised against subsidies resulting from an effort to increase food production. No voice has been raised against providing funds needed to support the support prices. The arguments arise as to subsidies to increase production and the roll-back or consumer subsidies.

THE POTATO SUBSIDY

Take the potato program as an example. The parity price of potatoes for 1943 was \$1.16 per bushel. The February 1944 parity price is \$1.22 a bushel. A support price of 90-plus cents a bushel was placed on potatoes in Wisconsin last year. The floor at the present time should be \$1.09 per bushel, which is 90 percent of the present parity price.

Due to the weather, the patriotic desire to produce and other factors, we had in 1943 a 461,000,000-bushel crop with an average production of 139 bushels to the acre. This crop was grown on a less number of acres than the acreage of many previous years. Also, some years the national average production has been under 100 bushels per acre.

Potatoes are selling in eastern cities at 3 to 4 cents a pound. This indicates the spread which is greater than the producer receives. In supporting the support price a large loss is being entailed by the Commodity Credit Corporation. The new southern crop is adding to this embarrassment. No one knows exactly how much the subsidy will be but for this example let us use twenty million. Here is a subsidy as a result of supporting the support price which support price was 90 cents-plus per bushel or 26 cents per

bushel below the parity price for 1943. Who pays this \$20,000,000 subsidy? The answer is, as you know, the general public in this and future generations.

With all respect, I would like to ask anyone in this college at whose feet I worshipped, or anyone else for that matter, to tell us why in the name of fairness and common sense one should advocate a roll-back or consumer subsidy to the potato consumers of this country? Before anyone answers though, I want him to take two facts into consideration—first, the fact that the producer received 26 cents per bushel less than parity price for producing the potatoes because, due to the large crop the support price became the ceiling price and the market price as well, and, secondly, the fact that the producer will be called upon to pay his share of the \$20,000,000 used to support the support price.

Potatoes are being distributed free to low-income groups at this time. This is justified, but why should future generations be asked to pay the potato bill of high-income people?

THE WHEAT SUBSIDY

Let us analyze the wheat situation briefly. The United States was, formerly, a great wheat-exporting Nation and exported up to 30 percent of the national production. We gradually lost this export market until in 1940 we exported only 3 percent of our national production and paid an export subsidy of 25 to 30 cents per bushel to dispose of it. We paid millions per year and nearly a billion in total during the past 10 years to control the wheat production, though we imported more wheat than we exported in 2 years during this time of large payments for controlling the domestic production. In 1930 there was a 42-cent-bushel duty put into effect. In 1940, by agreement, a quota arrangement was made whereby only 800,000 bushels of wheat can be imported annually. This is practically an embargo when considered in the light of our annual domestic production of seven hundred to nine hundred and fifty million bushels. Up until April 1943, we were still paying 25 to 30 cents per bushel export subsidy. The same month the Commodity Credit Corporation started subsidizing imports of wheat for feed purposes. Recently they announced a \$125,000,000-subsidy to the millers, which is supposed to be a consumer subsidy in order to hold down the price of bread. If the embargo were lifted millions of bushels of wheat would enter our country even with the 42-cent-per-bushel duty. If there is anyone that believes in this roll-back subsidy, I would like to ask him just one question: It is:

Since a commodity has the protection of a duty of 42 cents per bushel, and since a near embargo has been put into effect to implement the benefits of the 42-cents-per-bushel duty, can you justify a \$125,000,000 bread subsidy without giving your approval to the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, with the added protection of the near embargo? I say in all frankness, who wants to take a bite out of that one and try to justify the \$125,000,000 subsidy now going to the millers, though supposed to go to bread consumers? Do you wish to be in a position of advocating a consumer subsidy for bread under these conditions?

You ask, How about the lower-income group who pay such a larger percentage of their income for food in comparison to the higher-income groups? The proposal to meet this problem was the Aiken-La Follette-Herter bill that would have provided the lower- and fixed-income groups with a fair fixed food cost. This had rather weak W. F. A. support, and could not be passed by its sponsors. It appeared to me that a majority of the Members of Congress were favorable to this legislation. There should not be any stigma attached to such a food subsidy as long as Federal employees receiving \$10,000 to \$15,000 a year accept the \$628.32 cost of living bonus

under the guise of overtime was passed and was so gleefully accepted even by the very men whose purported task was to fight inflation.

This cost-of-living overtime pay increase to Government employees was passed with the implied understanding that the number of nonwar civilian employees was to be reduced.

There is one outstanding fact that seems more apparent each day, and that is that the only time we hear about inflation is when the low income groups are involved or when the American farmer is in the picture. Otherwise it apparently isn't very disturbing. Eight cents per hour to the railroad men would cause inflation although one-third of them receive 57 cents per hour or less, and later after much unnecessary criticism it wasn't. A 5 cents per bushel advance in the price of corn would cause inflation but later 9 cents per bushel wouldn't.

We have current surpluses of potatoes and wool and could quickly have a surplus of wheat. We have thousands of acres of good onion land not producing onions although there is a shortage of onions. Why? We have sufficient land to have a surplus of all these crops and could have the same surplus we have of potatoes. One reason we haven't a surplus of all foods is because we haven't had a maximum food production program as yet. We cannot get this maximum domestic production if we continually drain our farms of manpower and if we do not furnish the necessary machinery to produce it. We cannot expect to have a maximum food production program with too many conflicting changes, nor can we hope to have one unless we have a program that keeps faith better with the producer.

There are many complicating features in connection with any program that could be suggested. For example, is it logical to give South Carolina dairymen 30 cents a hundred-weight more as feed payments than is given Illinois dairymen when the February fixed price in South Carolina was \$1.10 a hundred-weight more in South Carolina than in Illinois and especially when cottonseed meal is \$10 a ton less in South Carolina than in Illinois? These are Government fixed prices and indicate the factors that must be considered. You can readily see why Mr. Walter Katterhenry our State A. A. A. chairman, when he was in Washington a couple of weeks ago, was interested in advocating a feed payment program that went right straight across the board.

Sometimes in my more irritated moments I think that they muddy the waters just so that they can get the credit for purifying the stream.

CONCLUSION

These are serious days. Congress has appropriated every dollar and given every power to most effectively carry on this war. The future with an expected \$300,000,000,000 national debt requires the conscientious study and the constructive approach of every American. The farms of the United States on January 1, 1940, had a value of only \$35,000,000,000. However, the old saying that every cloud has a silver lining is no doubt as true today as ever.

I shall not take a defeatist attitude toward the future. Everyone realizes that in our country there is still elbow room. When people have elbow room the problems of government are easier to solve. We have millions of acres of land in our country to be drained; we have other millions of acres that will show increases in production by following approved farm practices now known; we have millions of acres still to be irrigated; we have millions of acres in the United States to be developed, for new crops for new uses such as drug plants. The 30 to 50 percent increase in production of many food products during this war is conclusive evi-

dence of the fact that the food production of our Nation could be doubled if all idle acres were put to work and if the consumption demands would justify the expansion.

We are now seeing a greater appreciation of trees as a crop. Evidently, the use of wood or pulp is going to take a larger place in the feed, plastic, and fiber economies of the future. Millions of acres are adapted to this wood and pulp crop and I personally expect to see a keener appreciation of the possibilities in wood and pulp production as its uses multiply in number. Apparently, it is soon to be considered the same as other farm crops.

Secondly, when you realize the scientific discoveries that have taken place during this generation who are we to say that our sons and daughters will not come forward with additional scientific discoveries for the well-being and the welfare of the human race? In agriculture alone in our own State we have the Babcock, Russell, Hart, Farrington, and Steenbeck discoveries as well as their followers carrying on in their footsteps. We have the manufacture of urea—now being used for plastics—where the nitrogen of the air is combined with gases of the coke oven to make urea that is being used as a source of protein in livestock feed. We can picture sawdust piles transformed into dextrose stock piles or into alcohol or into rubber without having anyone question our sanity.

Many of you here at this great institution are in a much better position than I am to see the expanded opportunities for science to make in its forward march for the welfare of all mankind.

Thirdly, education contributes to making men free. Though some States like Iowa and Oregon have only 4 or 5 percent illiteracy, other States have over 30 percent illiteracy. Wisconsin has 9 percent. Our national interest will require at least a grammar-school education for every child in America. Social progress goes hand in hand with education. For example, it takes an educated country to have wage-and-hour legislation. The Wages and Hours Act with its maximum hours and minimum wage has the universal approval of our country. A permanent support-price program to agriculture could afford another large group of our society advantages comparable to the benefits of the wage-and-hour legislation to labor. These support prices could not be too high or embarrassing stock piles would accumulate, and we must keep in mind that the Wages and Hours Act does not provide a man a job either. My contacts with labor lead me to believe that they are most interested in a permanent job at a fair wage level. My observations in agriculture convince me that farmers are more interested in a continued fair price than they are in the feast and famine prices which they have been forced many times to accept. A farmers' cooperative gives the producer a bargaining agency and an approach to collective bargaining. This is comparable to the collective bargaining of a labor union. Thus more attention to security of the individual and the family is in the picture for every individual and for every group. However, the individual may take a more constructive interest in his own security and also the family he has the responsibility to protect. Such processes can only be successful in a country where education is the rule rather than the exception.

Finally—and the most important—I wish to call your attention to the fact that after the war we will have had some twelve to fifteen million men and women who have been in the war. From your acquaintance with the Civil War, the Spanish-American War and World War No. 1 veterans you know that these millions will come home with a patriotism and love of country that will not only be a part of them during their lifetime but will carry on to their children and their children's children. We should have confidence in their leadership. With this confi-

dence we can look forward to the future of our country regardless of any obstacles that may appear.

In conclusion, may I again express my appreciation of having been able to be with you. I appreciate the opportunity. I have made every effort as a Member of Congress to be a credit not only to my family, but also a credit to this great institution to which I owe so much, and to its professors, whom I still hold in such high esteem.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE].

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Chairman, the reclassification of doctors of veterinary medicine in the field services of the Bureau of Animal Industry and the Meat Inspection Division as authorized by the Classification Act of 1923 as amended has been completed and the War Food Administration and the Department of Agriculture have requested Congress to appropriate sufficient increases in the appropriations for the prevention, control, and eradication of animal diseases and for meat inspection for the payment of employees in these essential field services in accordance with the reclassification. These increases were requested after thorough study and consideration of the previous salary status of these services as compared with other groups in Government employ performing duties of like difficulty and responsibility and has the approval of the Civil Service Commission and the Director of the Budget.

The added compensation planned for these services would not give them a preferred position among Federal employees. It would merely give to them the same opportunities for advancement in pay, corresponding to the performance of tasks requiring special skill, that are afforded to others. As an example of this, I am informed that, although among other professional groups in the Department only 21.2 percent are in the beginning grade, 61.5 percent of the doctors of veterinary medicine are in this grade. Under the Classification Act of 1923 as amended, it is provided that employees should progress to the next grade, the regular "operating" grade, after satisfactory service in the beginning or "training grade." The proposal of the Department is to advance these employees in accordance with this principle. Because of a lack of funds to carry out the provisions of the Classification Act, 299 doctors of veterinary medicine have been in the beginning grade from 5 to 10 years; 82 have been in that grade from 3 to 5 years; and 150 have been in the beginning grade up to 3 years.

By way of contrast I would like to call your attention to status of attorneys in O. P. A., as revealed before the Subcommittee on Appropriations last year. Attorneys, like veterinarians, are subject to the provisions of the Classification Act respecting professional employees. I find that only 3.5 percent of the 1,412 attorneys were in the beginning grade, and only 2.5 percent in the next higher grade. Fully 96 percent received \$3,200 or more per annum, whereas only 10 percent of veterinarians receive that much. This contrast becomes more striking when one considers the many years of experience

which the veterinarians have to their credit.

It is not as well known as it should be that continued vigilance by veterinarians is required to protect food animals against the ravages of infectious disease, or that veterinary inspection of animals before slaughter, and of their carcasses after slaughter, provide the only means by which it can be determined whether meat for food is free from disease. You may not realize that the steady flow of cattle, hogs, and sheep to market is dependent upon the prevention of the spread and the eradication of animal diseases by veterinarians, and that the rate of kill by slaughterers in our meat-packing centers is strictly limited by the number of veterinarians furnished by the Meat Inspection Service to inspect food animals at the time slaughtered.

Animal-disease control and meat inspection require veterinary skill under the most trying and adverse conditions, with long hours of exacting work. The detection and determination of disease processes in herds of livestock or in animals presented for slaughter call for the application of specialized veterinary knowledge and sound veterinary judgment. The production and growth of millions of animals and the acceptance or rejection of billions of pounds of meat rest upon the decisions which must be made daily by the doctors of veterinary medicine. They must be ready at all times to back up their decisions with sound principles of veterinary medicine.

The livestock industry has never had a greater need for the services of veterinarians to enforce the quarantine laws and other laws passed for the prevention, eradication, and control of the diseases of farm animals. There are being sent to slaughter many more millions of food animals than ever before in our history. A large percentage of these animals must be slaughtered under Federal inspection. Numerous Federal purchasing agencies, such as the Army, Navy, and Lend-Lease are demanding more and more meat, all of which must be federally inspected. In addition, the demand by civilians for "U. S. inspected and passed" meats continues at a high level. The standards of inspection that have been developed during the past 35 years must be maintained. There is no such thing as half-way or limited veterinary inspection. The alternative to inspection by skilled veterinarians and well-trained assistants is no inspection at all.

No enterprise can long endure which fails to make provision for replacement of those who have devoted their lives to its service. Our veterinary colleges have for several years past discouraged their graduates from entering the Federal service, mainly because of the meager opportunities for advancement. Surely the young men who have devoted 5 years of college study to acquire the degree of doctor of veterinary medicine do not look with favor upon the prospect of remaining as long as 10 years in the beginner's grade. It is essential to the maintenance of these services that the better type of veterinary college gradu-

ates and lay assistants may be influenced to enter the Federal services. They must some day replace the highly trained employees of today with long experience in these services.

These doctors of veterinary medicine and their lay assistants receive benefits under the overtime pay bill of last year. You should realize, however, that the overtime pay is predicated on the regular or base pay of the employees. Here is a group of employees whose base pay is not on a par with others according to the provisions of the Classification Act provided by the Congress. They cannot have full enjoyment of the overtime provisions until their base pay is put on a level with other Federal employees doing equal work. The proposed reclassification is designed to accomplish this.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] may extend the remarks he made previously this afternoon and include an editorial and certain letters and telegrams.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ROWE].

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, the matter has come to my attention in an attempt to distribute certain publications that are made available to Members of the House for their respective constituents, of the apparent inequity with which they are allotted or allocated to the Members. I believe I represent at least the third or fourth largest congressional district in the United States in population. In my attempt to obtain certain publications that are made available to the Members of this House intended ultimately as a public good this apparent inequity became obvious to me. I refer particularly to a little book put out by the Marine Corps, known as Our Flag. That book, I am sure, was never intended that Congressmen should have in unlimited numbers without regard for other Members as a matter of possession. The Congressman is merely the office or facility whereby books and pamphlets such as this are distributed through the schools and to different people, so that the knowledge thereby disseminated will result ultimately in some benefit to the whole country. There are congressional districts which Members represent in this body, with a population around a quarter of a million, and in many instances even less than that. There are other congressional districts in which the population runs up to nearly a million.

It is not difficult to see the obvious injustice of allocating to a Member who has one hundred and fifty thousand or two hundred thousand the same number of these books or editions as is allocated to a Member who has a million, if the intent was to have that publication equitably distributed among the people.

I do not know what is to be done to secure the proper distribution of this material, but I would like to see a rule put into effect in this House providing that

the distribution would be made on the basis of the last Federal census. If the publication is intended for the public, and the Representative in Congress is the facility whereby the public is to obtain different pamphlets, it seems to me they should be distributed according to the population of the congressional districts as evenly as possible.

I encountered this rather embarrassing situation: The most populated city of my district has 37,500 school children alone. In my attempt to get some of these books, Our Flag, to be distributed for the benefit of knowledge that might be inculcated in the minds of the school children concerning our great flag and its worth which they should come to know and appreciate, I find I can only make partial distribution within limited grades. If I do that it will probably result in criticism of me because I have not impartially distributed them because of limited numbers. I have to forego distribution of any of them in order that there will not be any partiality shown. I am limited, according to a letter received from Lieutenant General Vandegrift, to 10,000 of these books, yet there are nearly 800,000 people in my congressional district and 52,000 school children in 1 of 5 cities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ROWE] has expired.

All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF SERGEANT AT ARMS AND DOORKEEPER
Salaries: Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, \$8,000; 2 secretaries (1 for the majority and 1 for the minority), at \$5,400 each and \$1,500 additional each so long as the respective positions are held by the present respective incumbents; 2 assistant secretaries (1 for the majority and 1 for the minority), at \$4,320 each and \$480 additional each so long as the respective positions are held by the present respective incumbents; Deputy Sergeant at Arms and storekeeper, \$4,800 and \$1,000 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; clerks—1, \$3,300; 1, \$3,120; 1, \$2,200; 1, \$2,120; and 1, \$1,800; 1 to the secretary for the majority \$2,280 and \$120 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; 1 to the secretary for the minority, \$2,280 and \$120 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; assistant doorkeeper, \$2,800; messengers—3 (acting as assistant doorkeepers) at \$2,400 each; 1 at \$1,740 and \$260 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; 29 (including 4 for minority) at \$1,740 each; 4 at \$1,620 each; 1 at card door, \$2,640, and \$240 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; clerk on Journal work for CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to be selected by the Official Reporters, \$3,360; cabinetmakers—chief, \$2,780; 1, \$2,300; 1, \$2,040; finisher, \$2,300; upholsterer, \$2,040; janitor, \$2,400 and \$300 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; 5 skilled laborers, \$1,680 each; laborer in charge of private passage, \$1,740 and \$120 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; 4 female attendants in charge of ladies' retiring rooms, at \$1,500 each; 3 female attendants in charge of ladies' retiring rooms, Senate Office Building, at \$1,500 each; telephone operators—chief \$2,460 and \$280 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; 14 at \$1,620 each; laborer in charge of Senate toilet rooms in old library space, \$1,200; press gallery—superintendent, \$3,660; assistant superintendent, \$3,000; as-

sistant superintendent, \$1,920; messengers for service to press correspondents—2 at \$1,560 each, 2 at \$1,440 each; radio press gallery—superintendent, \$3,000; assistant superintendent, \$1,960; laborers—3 at \$1,380 each, 28 at \$1,260 each, 3 at \$480 each; special employees—7 at \$1,000 each; 21 pages for the Senate Chamber, at the rate of \$4 per day each, during the session, \$15,204; in all, \$273,944.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. You know it is almost sacrilegious for any of us today to talk about our discomforts here when we consider what our boys are suffering on the various battle fronts. Last evening I heard Eddie Rickenbacker tell of his experiences and the experiences of our armed forces throughout the world. It was one of the most amazing revelations that I had heard. The thing that amazes me is how little the people back home know about what is happening everywhere throughout the world to our men in the armed forces, what difficulties they are enduring, and how complacent we are in face of it.

Being mindful of the foregoing, I hope my colleagues will forgive me if I reopen a matter which I am sure causes us some degree of discomfort. I am still hopeful that an effective remedy will be found for ridding these office buildings of the cockroaches which infest them, and which you will admit are a nuisance at times. I might suggest that instead of our having to keep cockroach pills strewn around our offices something be done about it, starting with the basement floors.

This is the time to call attention to this problem, when we appropriate money for cleaning purposes.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not do so now, but I am greatly tempted to offer an amendment to the appropriate clause of the bill to increase the salaries of the Members of this body to \$15,000 a year. It is high time somebody started the ball rolling in that regard; and I make the pledge here and now that when the next appropriation bill comes along for the legislative branch I shall have the temerity, if I may use that word, to offer an amendment to increase our compensation. Ours is the only case where there is a successful ceiling on salaries, despite the fact that the cost of living has gone up tremendously. Superimposed upon the expenses which we, for example, from the State of New York have to pay, is a State income tax at a very high rate; and if anyone happens to be so unfortunate as to have fixed charges that he must regularly meet he is in a deplorable state indeed. I refer to fixed charges such as interest on mortgages on homes or farms or on business properties, fixed rental charges, the payment of interest, and reductions of principle on indebtedness, insurance premiums.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a simple question? Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Does the gentleman appreciate the fact that this Congress has raised the salaries of all Federal employees more than enough to offset the increased income tax, but has made no increase whatsoever in the salaries of the Members?

Mr. CELLER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. HANCOCK. I wish to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that since Tom Dewey has been Governor of New York our New York State income tax has been reduced 25 percent.

Mr. CELLER. That is due in part to the fact that we have stood in the rostrum here and others have stood in the rostrum of the New York State Legislature and said in no uncertain language to that gentleman that he must reduce the income tax because of the vast amount of surplus we have in New York State. I would that he reduce the income tax to an even greater degree.

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes; but does the gentleman recall any Governor in recent years who has left a surplus?

Mr. CELLER. Accrediting the State income-tax reduction to Governor Dewey is ignoring the actual factors that were in the main responsible for such deduction. It is quite apparent that the Governor of the State of New York is no financial expert. Certainly, the decrease was due to nothing he contributed, either by word or deed. He had no choice in the matter. The prosperity of New York is not of his making; rather it is of the period through which we are now passing. He may have social grace and charm, but he is no more a financial expert than he is a constitutional law expert. Witness his castigation of our great Commander in Chief on the matter of a Federal ballot for our armed forces, and his deeming such ballot unconstitutional. He probably never heard of the First and Second War Power Acts which gives almost supreme powers to the President and amply justifies a soldiers' vote bill federally controlled. Our work in this chamber and outside this chamber, too, as the Members realize, has greatly increased. There is a greater strain on us, and beyond the peradventure of a doubt, our medical and dental bills have greatly increased in the last few years because of that strain, and I think it is high time we gave some attention to paying adequate compensation to ourselves.

I may be called that one who rushes in where angels fear to tread for making this statement, and I may be severely criticized for it at home. My opponent in the next election may seize avidly upon what I say here this afternoon as being what he calls a good campaign missile against me. I care not, Mr. Chairman. I am sure the good people of my district, when they view the work I have done over the years—for almost 22 years—will realize that I am speaking truly and adequately, and if I may be so bold as to

say so, wisely, with reference to what we so thoroughly deserve, namely, an increase to at least \$15,000 in salary.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries: Seven official reporters of the proceedings and debates of the House at \$7,500 each; clerk, \$4,000; assistant clerk, \$2,000; six expert transcribers at \$2,000 each; in all, \$70,500.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, about 2 weeks ago I discussed on the floor the workings and operations of the War Manpower Commission as it relates to my own congressional district. I said at that time that the regulations and orders of the War Manpower Commission were, in my humble opinion, retarding the war production program in that area. The truth of this statement is available in my office. I turned the data I had in my possession over to the Smith committee and have received the assurance of the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, Congressman SMITH, that just as soon as they complete an investigation they are now conducting they will look into this situation. I thought, however, that Members of the House might be interested in a small part of the report made by the secretary of the Hartford County Manufacturers' Association on March 14. I have in my hand here a rather interesting chart showing both the man-hours and the number of employees employed in that area from August 1939 to 1944. The number of employees has gone up from 59,000 in 1939 to 135,000 as of January 1, 1944. It is rather interesting to note that each year, in fact each month, from September 1939 to date, or in reality up to February 1, 1943, the number of man-hours and the number of employees increased. At that point the War Manpower Commission came into the picture with their restrictive regulations. It is enlightening to note that each month of the year 1943 up to March 1, 1944, the trend has been downward from a high of 245 percent to 212 percent of normal. As a further indication that their regulations are retarding progress I want to quote from this report of the manufacturers' association.

A company, which through its own representatives solicited housewives in the immediate vicinity of the factory, discovered 46 who were willing, because of the proximity of their homes, to enter into a contract of employment which would enable them to put in a full day, after they had bundled their children off to school before 8 in the morning, until they get home to receive them, just before 5.

The United States Employment Service and the Manpower Commission refused to issue certificates of availability to these women to work in that specific factory. The result—they are not working.

A company which because of cut-back in contract, released a large number of its employees is faced now with a charge of unemployment insurance for 27 of them who refused work in companies

where they believed their talents could not be used, or for personal reason, or where the distance from home was great enough to offer a hardship. They obviously are walking the streets of Hartford, because the State unemployment commission has granted them compensation.

It certainly is ridiculous in an area declared by the War Manpower Commission as a group 1 critical labor scarcity area that hundreds of people are drawing unemployment compensation. It does not make sense and I am hopeful that I can convince the House Military Affairs Committee or the chairman of that committee that there are various phases of this program that merit the attention of that committee.

In the columns of the Hartford Times, under date of March 7, an employer, given permission to advertise, states that he curtailed a 3-day advertisement in 2 days because he was able to recruit in Hartford, 25 people—the sum total that he needed, who were idle. The manufacturer involved is quoted as saying that some of the applicants who responded had been hanging around the United States Employment Service a couple of afternoons for hours at the time and they carried their registration cards from the Employment Office to prove it.

Another plant, where cut-backs permitted a release of 179 persons, discovered through investigation that 77 of them after a month's time, are not employed in any factory in Hartford County.

Thirty-seven women, recruited from homes in the immediate vicinity of an industrial plant for part-time work—the designation of part time, by the United States Employment Service, is 30 hours or less per week—after acquiring a greater knowledge of their duties, requested the company to put them on full-shift operation. The blanket request by the company, so the workers could make more money and increase production, was refused by the United States Employment Service—on the grounds that if they were full-time workers, they would have to be discharged, receive certificates of availability, and be sent to so-called more critical industries. These are actual cases. How many similar situations exist, or the number of persons they would include must of course be developed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 106. This title may be cited as the "Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1945."

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 19, committee employees, in order to offer an amendment to that section.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 19, line 4, after the word "clerk", strike out "\$2,760" and insert "\$3,300."

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, this has to do with the work of one of the most important committees of the House, the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, of which I have the honor and the responsibility of being chairman.

This committee is charged with a tremendous amount of work. We have to deal with legislation affecting all the policies of reclamation throughout the whole of the United States and particularly the Northwest. We have to deal with authorizations involving irrigation projects, we have to deal with all legislation affecting those projects, we have to deal with the policies of the Government in the development of this country, we have to search out the provisions of the laws and know their application in connection with the formation of these projects and their effect and bearing on the rights of the Federal Government and the constitutional rights of our States.

I submit that the paltry salary of \$2,700 which is paid at the present time to the clerk of our committee, which has a membership of some 22 Members of this House, is not adequate pay for such clerk and, in my opinion, it is time that we give a salary that will bring to the service of that committee a clerk equipped with the necessary qualifications to study the laws, do the research work that is necessary, and handle the business of our Members so that we may adequately protect the interests of the Government and the water users on the lands throughout the country. Here we have a \$2,700 clerk for the Congress and the people we represent to deal with a whole set of executive and administrative officials in the departments who get three times that salary with much less to do.

Mr. PLOESER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. The gentleman realizes, of course, that such an authorization should come from the Committee on Accounts? It does not originate with the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. WHITE. I may say to the gentleman that an authorization coming direct from the House would have just as much weight as coming from any minority committee. I am submitting this to the Congress in order to bring the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation in line with a lot of the other committees of the House. Our committee is in the lowest brackets. The clerks to the main committees get a much higher salary and they have more clerks. This committee is doing a fine work, yet its clerk is on the lowest scale of all the committees and for that reason I am taking the opportunity at the present time to ask the House in the case of this particular committee to give a sufficient amount of remuneration so that the committee can bring to its assistance a qualified clerk to do the work that it is required to do and handle it in a way that will be a credit to the House and to the country.

Mr. Chairman, I submit this is an important amendment and I ask for its support by the Members of the House.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. Chairman, there are over 2,000 employees here and every year the committee and individual Members of the Congress are importuned by hundreds of people to change their salaries. We are asked to change this salary, and that salary, we are told that this man is not getting what he should get and that the other fellow should get more. The only way to handle the situation is to have the matter thoroughly considered by the fine Chairman of the Committee on Accounts, which is the legislative committee for this Appropriations Subcommittee. That committee goes into those matters carefully. If it recommends an increase to us the chances are it will be in the bill but you cannot on the floor of the House adjust all the salaries and do justice to all the employees deserving of consideration, because if you give it to one, there may be 10 others who are as much justified in getting an increase. Therefore, this should be done by an independent investigation and that is the way it is handled by the Committee on Accounts. I trust the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE] will be defeated.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. Just to keep the record straight, I will say to the gentleman from Idaho that half of the committees of the House today are paying their clerks \$2,760. That includes the Committee on Banking and Currency, the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the Committee on Insular Affairs, the Committee on Coinage, Weights and Measures, and other committees.

If you are going to do that for one committee you are going to upset the applecart.

The Committee on Accounts has had a special committee trying to work out some method to satisfy some of those who have been complaining over a long period.

Mr. O'NEAL. I will say to the gentleman that they also get their additional 15 percent in lieu of war overtime.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman knows there are many secretaries in Congress and in other offices that are getting paid far in excess of the amount authorized by law.

Mr. O'NEAL. I will say to the gentleman there may be inequalities all the way through, but I say it ought to be done by the proper committee and not on the floor because some Member is particularly interested in some one person.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman knows that by law the Congress can pay up to \$3,950 a year for one secretary.

Mr. O'NEAL. Yes; I know that.

Mr. WHITE. Many of them are doing it, but we are bound, we cannot do a thing with \$2,700.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Whirre) there were—ayes 3, noes 56.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 301. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who advocates or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment, the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this act, shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that some of us are not convinced that the men who dig the coal in this country should have portal-to-portal pay, the coal miners, in other words. I think that some people do not understand what "portal to portal" means.

May I call your attention to it in this light? I happen to live about 13 miles from a plumber. If a washer goes bad in my sink I have to get this plumber to come from the other town. He starts out at 9 o'clock on Sunday morning. He takes his helper with him. He gets \$1.50 an hour, and the helper gets 90 cents an hour. They get out in the sun and drive down to my place and go in and look it over. It takes 20 minutes to put on a washer. Then they drive back the 13 miles, and when they get back they look at the clock and they find that it took them 3 hours, they charge me \$9.32 for that trip, for 20 minutes' work.

The miner goes to the pit mouth, or the shaft, and he may have to go in 1 mile, 2 miles, 3, 4, or 5 miles, and some think he ought not to be paid for going in there to the place where he is going to actually start to dig, as it were, or use his machine. I say he should be paid from the time he enters the pit mouth till he comes out.

I am not kicking about the plumber being paid. That is perfectly all right with me. I am just trying to draw a comparison, that, if the plumber is paid, why should not the miner be paid when he starts into that pit mouth, especially in these days when all the care in the world cannot be taken, the mines are many times cold and dreary and slushy and sleeting, electric wires are liable to be hanging loose some place and bad conditions prevail, yes he takes his life in his hands. Sometimes they go in only half a mile, some places 2 miles, 3 miles, and in my district, up to 5 miles.

I think it is altogether humane that coal miners should be paid portal-to-

portal pay from the time they step into the mouth of the pit or the top of the shaft when they start down till they come back to the same place.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield.

Mr. WRIGHT. I am glad to hear the gentleman saying something on behalf of the work of the coal miners.

Mr. SNYDER. I have said quite a bit in the last 12 years for them.

Mr. WRIGHT. I know the gentleman has. He is a friend of the miners and has spoken in their behalf.

May I remark also that, as the gentleman knows, the occupation of coal-mining is difficult, dangerous, and requires a lot of skill, and the compensation which the miner gets, contrasted with the wages in other industries, has always seemed to me to be out of line with the type of work he has to do. I certainly feel that when they ask for more money they have not been unreasonable in doing so.

Mr. SNYDER. I said 3 months ago that they should have an increase. I did not know the scale of wages and did not know what the increase should be, but they should have had a liberal increase at that time.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I gladly yield to my friend from Kansas.

Mr. STEFAN. I come from a country where we do not mine coal. We have to buy it and burn it for heat. I have visited coal mines. I agree with the gentleman. I have seen those miners come to work in the evening or in the morning. They report to the office and they get aboard these cars and are shunted into the pit. I think it is reasonable that they should be given portal-to-portal pay.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Printing and binding: For printing and binding for the administrative office and courts of the United States, \$89,000.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOULSON. Mr. Chairman, it is naturally with a great deal of satisfaction that I announce to Congress that the Navy is today starting a preliminary reconnaissance group to Alaska by air to ascertain the potentialities of its Oil Reserve No. 4, which comprises 35,000 square miles in the northernmost part of Alaska. I am the only Member who has advocated the development of these great oil prospects, based on all geological reports.

The need for the development of new fields is recognized today to be most urgent. The personnel of this group comprises the most technical men experienced in both oil production and general construction, who are members of the Seabees, which organization has

played a great part in this present war. All of these men have had experience in the far Arctic regions and the Aleutians, another place where the Seabees have been so instrumental in our success.

It is indeed gratifying to state that the man heading this expedition is none other than William T. Foran, who originally convinced me of the great possibilities in this area, he having been a member of the geological survey group of the Government, which made the original survey in 1923 and 1924.

The eyes of the world will be on the findings of this group. They have a logical and practical program outlined and will proceed on a sound basis, namely that they will make a survey of all problems of transportation, housing, provisioning, and general working conditions, in addition to obtaining further geological findings. In other words, this time we will not be drilling wells, building pipe lines and refineries until we have these preliminary findings.

I am herewith quoting a Navy release:

The departure for Alaska of a reconnaissance engineering group marks the beginning of an exploratory program by Navy to determine the ultimate usefulness of Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4 at Point Barrow.

Little is known as to the potentialities of this area of 35,000 square miles at the northernmost tip of Alaska except that oil seepages have been found in several places, but the belief is that it holds large quantities of oil.

The reconnaissance party will begin at once preliminary work on the job of ascertaining what the oil resources are. It will study and report upon problems of transportation, housing, provisioning, and general working conditions which will confront geological parties and drilling crews which it is expected to send into the reserve later in the spring and summer. Appropriations are being sought currently to provide for this work.

Alaska has not yet produced much satisfactory evidence of possessing substantial quantities of recoverable oil. Several private companies have carried on explorations at various places with somewhat disappointing results but, despite this, the Territory remains generally regarded as geologically promising. Development of the fields and transportation of the oil when produced present many problems, and much exploratory and experimental work will have to be done before the real petroleum possibilities of the Territory will be definitely known. It is frankly expected that much of the drilling in the Point Barrow reserve will be of a speculative nature.

Harold Ickes, as Petroleum Administrator for War, and the Geological Survey of the Department of the Interior have been fully advised of Navy's exploratory program for Point Barrow. Navy expects to take full advantage of the technical abilities and services available in other Government agencies, and duplication of effort is to be avoided.

The Alaskan exploration now set in motion is a part of a broader program which Navy has formulated for its petroleum reserves in line with the resurgence of interest in oil as one of the Nation's key problems. Another of Navy's reserves about which relatively little is known is No. 1, located in the Elk Hills region of California. The only substantial exploration of this reserve has been in the shallow oil zone in the eastern end of the field. The large area to the west and the deeper Stevens zone are unexplored. The Navy has plans there, too.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RICHARDS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4414) making appropriations for the legislative branch and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I do this for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. On Monday there will be the Consent Calendar, to be followed by the rivers and harbors bill. On Tuesday we will consider the Private Calendar, to be followed by the rivers and harbors bill. On Wednesday I expect the agricultural appropriation bill will be taken up and remain the order of business for the remainder of the week. Of course the conference report upon the U. N. R. A. bill will be taken up when the Senate disposes of it. If there is any change in the program, if any other legislation comes up, other than by unanimous consent, I shall advise my friend from Michigan and the House, in ample time.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman tell us when the U. N. R. A. conference report is likely to come before the House?

Mr. McCORMACK. I cannot. As we have already gone over until Monday, it surely will not come up until next week anyway.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation:

MARCH 15, 1944.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the United States
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the following committees of the United States House of Representatives, to be effective when accepted: Rivers and Harbors, World War Veterans' Legislation, Education, Claims, Public Buildings and Grounds, District of Columbia, and Patents.

Yours very truly,

WILLIAM A. ROWAN,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], may have unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, in one instance and include a short article, and also to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include a statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include certain excerpts in the extension of my remarks made in committee this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a release issued by me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order today for 30 minutes. I yield back that time, and ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. FERNANDEZ, for 15 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. HOCH, for March 20 and 21, on account of death in family.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1618. An act to amend the acts of August 26, 1935 (49 Stat. 866), May 11, 1938 (52 Stat. 347), June 15, 1938 (52 Stat. 699), and June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1205), which authorizes the appropriation of receipts from certain national forests for the purchase of lands within the boundaries of such forests, to provide that any such receipts not appropriated or appropriated but not expended or obligated shall be disposed of in the same manner as other national-forest receipts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1634. An act to provide for the management and operation of naval plantations out-

side the continental United States; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1682. An act to provide for the payment of compensation to certain claimants for the taking by the United States of private fishery rights in Pearl Harbor, Island of Oahu, Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1748. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to requisition property required for the defense of the United States," approved October 16, 1941, as amended, to continue it in effect; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1749. An act to amend section 3 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to requisition certain articles and materials for the use of the United States, and for other purposes," approved October 10, 1940, as amended, to continue it in effect; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 929. An act for the relief of Irving L. Jones;

H. R. 1062. An act for the relief of the estate of John H. Cathcart;

H. R. 1201. An act to permit prosecutions after the lapse of a temporary statute for offenses committed prior to its expiration;

H. R. 1273. An act for the relief of the heirs of Simon M. Myhre;

H. R. 1469. An act for the relief of Robert Beckwith, Julius Buettner, and Emma M. Buettner;

H. R. 1488. An act to provide a right-of-way for an oil pipe line over the Ogden Ordnance Depot Military Reservation;

H. R. 1518. An act for the relief of Mrs. Bessie Pike and Mrs. Estelle Rosenfeld;

H. R. 1847. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Richard Zielinski, a minor;

H. R. 2091. An act for the relief of Mrs. Gladys M. Greenleaf and the estate of Ralph Alton Greenleaf, deceased;

H. R. 2183. An act for the relief of Mathilde B. Meister;

H. R. 2189. An act for the relief of Kenneth E. Shepard;

H. R. 2385. An act for the relief of Nadine Gorman;

H. R. 2419. An act to change the name of "laborer" in the Postal Service to that of "mail handler";

H. R. 2440. An act for the relief of Mrs. Priscilla B. McCarthy;

H. R. 2459. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Carl Oplinger, City Hospital of Akron, Ohio, and to Dr. Walter A. Hoyt;

H. R. 2772. An act for the relief of Edwin Foley;

H. R. 2875. An act for the relief of Adelard Demers;

H. R. 2890. An act for the relief of H. G. Tooley;

H. R. 2956. An act for the protection of the water supply of the city of Sitka, Alaska;

H. R. 2993. An act for the relief of John W. Booth III;

H. R. 2999. An act for the relief of Leo Gullo;

H. R. 3139. An act for the relief of Henry Grossi;

H. R. 3173. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Lorraine Novak, a minor;

H. R. 3195. An act for the relief of Willard Kerr, Jr.;

H. R. 3371. An act for the relief of the dependents of Dr. Arthur B. Wyse, and others;

H. R. 3387. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Jason McVay Austin;

H. R. 3547. An act for the relief of Carl F. R. Wilson;

H. R. 3618. An act to authorize the War Food Administrator to sell and convey to Mrs. Andrew J. Frey, and her heirs, a certain tract of land, situated in the county of San Joaquin, State of California, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3701. An act for the relief of Clinton A. Clauson; and

H. R. 3763. An act to relieve former postal employees who performed postal duties after induction into the military service.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1285. An act to facilitate voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces, members of the merchant marine, and others, absent from the place of their residence, and to amend the act of September 16, 1942, and for other purposes; and

S. 1589. An act for the relief of C. Guy Evans, Garland Mineral Springs, Index, Wash.

THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE JAMES A. O'LEARY

MR. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is with genuine sadness that I announce the death of our late lamented colleague, Mr. JAMES A. O'LEARY, from the State of New York. I have known Jim personally, as we familiarly called him, for a great many years, and I and others in this Chamber over the years have learned to respect and have for him a most affectionate regard. I repeat the words of Genesis, "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." Nonetheless, it is indeed very sad to note the parting of this good and loyal friend. It is difficult to say farewell to one as loyal as he, to one as sincere. He has gone to that undiscovered country, from whose bourne no traveler returns. As I grew to know JIM I always felt that he followed most religiously the teachings and admonitions of the great prophet Micah, who said that he always loved mercy, did justice, and walked humbly. Jim by his deeds and by his words did indeed walk humbly and he loved mercy and did justice. He was ever kind, benign, and gentle. Though quiet in demeanor, he had great stability of character. In his very meekness there was great strength. I would say that he knew the soft, sad music of humanity. He never feared death. He was sick for an undue length of time. He said to me, "Why fear that which is inevitable, and death is inevitable?" I agree with the poet, "What is death? At most it is a journey for a season, and a sleep longer than usual. If thou fearest death, thou shouldst fear also sleep." Jim had no fear in his heart. I would say, in conclusion, that God has put His finger upon him; and he sleeps.

MR. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, in the first sad hour of shock it is always difficult for me to express the emotions that I feel coursing through my mind. Such a shock has come to me twice in the last 2 weeks, once when I lost a friend in Tom Cullen, who served in this House for 24 years, and now again when I lose another who has been close to me for 8 years, JIM O'LEARY. I was very fond of him. I shall always remember with great pleasure the many

happy hours that we spent together when I would refresh myself in his sound, American philosophy. To talk to JIM O'LEARY reminded me of the way Amos must have felt when he said, "When I want strength I kiss the earth." When I wanted strength it was nice to feel that I could, in a manner of speaking, kiss the hand of my friend, JIM O'LEARY. I do not know that I would be exaggerating at all, Mr. Speaker, if I were to say more sincerely Jim was one of the finest characters I ever knew, simple and sweet. He had the three characteristics that I think make the measure of a man. He was courageous, he was tolerant, and he was kind. He was courageous even in these days when courage is not always too evident. He was courageous because he never failed to announce his conception of Americanism. He believed in this country, in this country above all things. I am sorry to say that in many realms of society that is not too popular today. But JIM O'LEARY never faltered in his devotion to his country. Therefore I think that at this moment we have lost a man whom we can ill afford to lose. The Nation suffers. I in my personal life suffer. Strange, is it not, how lonely life grows as the years accumulate? We see snatched from us from time to time the things we have grown to love, the things that become actually a part of us. They are snatched from us through no act of ours and they leave us tremendously saddened. The loss of JIM O'LEARY will leave an ache in my heart that nothing that I can conceive of will ever fill.

MR. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, every Member of the Congress has heard with deep regret of the demise of our dear friend and colleague, JIM O'LEARY.

He was my dear friend and, with many Members of the House, I shall miss him very much. He was a credit to his city, State, and Nation. As Chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments he did a splendid job and reflected great credit on his ability as a leader and an executive.

The fine work he did as a member of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries is well known to the Members of this House. Although ill at the time, he, in the pursuit of his duties, went on a long and tedious trip to the west coast to get a true picture of the marine situation there.

To his family go the sympathy and condolence of all of us in the Congress.

MR. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, God in His wisdom has seen fit to reach out and take from our midst one of our very dear and loyal friends, a valuable asset to the House of Representatives; JIM O'LEARY was a true friend and a good American. A man who at this moment has one son giving his very best so that we can continue in this deliberation in which we are taking part this afternoon. The things that Jim stood for were pronounced by his every deed and his every action up until this present moment. His suffering was tremendous, not only his physical suffering, but his mental suffering as well, having just suffered the

loss of his dear wife. I am sure his son and daughters will be happy in the knowledge that he has left behind him many, many friends. We stood here no more than 2 weeks ago and uttered practically the same words in behalf of another departed colleague. But, just as often as we repeat those words, just as often are we that much more sincere in our eulogy of the passing of a great and dearly beloved friend.

Jim's absence is a tremendous blow, not only to the constituents in his district, and to his family, but especially to his friends, among whom I am happy to know that I was numbered.

MR. SPEAKER, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MR. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the grim hand of death has again visited this body. For 10 years our late friend, JIM O'LEARY, as his friends knew and called him, labored in this body, giving a character of service to his people and his country which it will be difficult for anyone who succeeds him to surpass. We who knew him personally, we who were numbered among his friends, feel keenly the passing of JIM O'LEARY and we are going to miss him greatly from among our ranks.

I remember well seeing him last fall on two occasions in Boston when he was there undergoing medical treatment in connection with the illness which brought about his death this morning. With full knowledge of the seriousness of his condition, as was evidenced in my talks with him, he viewed it from a fine, high, noble, philosophical, and religious angle. Those two talks which were among the last I had with him, the philosophical way in which he considered his illness, made a very strong impression upon me.

For 10 years he gave the best that was within him to his people and to his country by sincere and faithful and loyal service in this body. As previous speakers have well said, he was sincere. We can all subscribe to that beautiful trait possessed by our late friend. But more than sincere, he was kind. He was a man who encouraged others. He was a man of understanding. The passing of JIM O'LEARY leaves another gap in our ranks.

To his children I extend my profound sympathy in their bereavement. To the people of his district I extend my feeling of sympathy in the loss of their great Representative. I know that they appreciate the character of service that he so ably gave to them. And to our colleagues of the New York delegation I also express my sympathy because each and every one of them were not only personal friends of our late colleague, JIM O'LEARY, but he also was one of their delegation.

The New York delegation has had two visitations of death within a few weeks. There is no finer delegation in this House than the New York delegation. I deeply sympathize with them in the loss from their ranks of a sincere and kindly character, a man of understanding, our late friend and colleague, JIM O'LEARY.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may care to use to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FAY].

Mr. FAY. Mr. Speaker, this is the second time in 30 days that death has visited the ranks of the New York delegation. Only 2 weeks ago we attended the funeral of the venerable Tom Cullen, of Brooklyn. Today we mourn the loss of Congressman JIM O'LEARY, of Staten Island. He was a businessman of fine accomplishments. Last summer I spent 2 months in the hospital on Staten Island, in his district. I came in contact with the civilian personnel who lived on Staten Island. Everyone spoke highly of JIM O'LEARY as their Representative. He exerted considerable influence in developing Staten Island as a great port in the harbor of New York. He brought business and manufacturing to Staten Island, and it now stands today as a great important section of our city.

We shall miss JIM O'LEARY. I extend to his family my profound sympathy and respect for a great father and husband who typified the qualities of a gentleman.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] such time as he may care to use.

Mr. BENDER. We all know how futile mere words are on an occasion like this. I happen to be a member of the Committee on Expenditures and I knew JIM O'LEARY well. He was all that the distinguished majority leader stated. He was kindly and friendly and generous to a fault. He was a good friend. He was a strong partisan. No man served the Democratic Party better as chairman of the Committee on Expenditures than JIM O'LEARY, and he was always fair and considerate of every minority member of the committee. I join the New York Members in mourning his passing. I am sure if any man deserves a place in the heavenly throng, JIM O'LEARY does.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BURCHILL] may extend his remarks in the Record at this point.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BURCHILL of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is with deepest sympathy and a sense of the greatest loss that I join with my colleagues in announcing to this body the passing of my beloved colleague, the Honorable JAMES A. O'LEARY, of Staten Island, N. Y. JIM O'LEARY has been, in addition, my dear friend and neighbor, as we had the distinction of representing adjoining districts in the State of New York. This enabled me to appraise his character and abilities from observations as well as association. His legislative record and judgment were unsurpassed during his term of service in this body

and his character, demonstrated as a Member of this House and his community, was beautiful in its simplicity and dignity.

Jim knew the sorrow that follows the irreplaceable loss that comes with the passing of a close and dear one, having suffered the loss of his beloved wife a short time ago. Since that time he has devoted his life to his lovely family of two daughters and one son, Lt. James A. O'Leary, Jr., now serving his country. There is so little I can say to them in their hour of sorrow that would in the smallest measure approach the adequate. I can only extend my personal sympathy and hope that God will give them that supernatural strength He sends to all of us at some time in our lives when the need for it arises. The memory of their father will rest with this House throughout the years to come. It is a memory which will hallow and revere his many years of loyal and faithful service. The high regard in which he was held by the leadership and his colleagues on both sides of the aisle, who sat in stricken silence today at the grave announcement of our loss, serves as mute and golden evidence of the great esteem in which JIM O'LEARY has always been held by this honorable body.

Because of the location of his district, JIM O'LEARY's greatest interest and most of his life were devoted to maritime matters. In memoriam I am reminded of those famous and beautiful words of the epitaph of Robert Louis Stevenson which might well have been uttered by JIM O'LEARY as he went to his Heavenly resting place:

Here he lies where he longed to be;
Home is the sailor, home from the sea,
And the hunter home from the hill.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARRIS] such time as he may care to use.

Mr. HARRIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, one of my first committee assignments on coming to the House was to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. At that time, JIM O'LEARY was one of the ranking Democrats on the committee. I came to know him exceedingly well through a common interest we had in more than one project concerning our respective districts. Through this association I quickly came to recognize his great ability, to respect his judgment, and to admire and have great affection for him personally. He was an independent thinker, a man of courage, and of courageous action. He is another of our beloved colleagues who have gone down fighting on the legislative firing line. We can ill afford to spare his like. We sorely shall miss him. His memory ever will remain green in our minds. Our hearts fully of sympathy go out to his children.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TORRENS] such time as he may care to use.

Mr. TORRENS. Mr. Speaker, although I did not have the honor of knowing Congressman O'LEARY but slightly, still I knew of the splendid work he did as a Member of Congress.

With his colleagues I join in offering my sympathy and my condolence to his bereaved family.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOMERS].

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I made the acquaintance of JAMES O'LEARY when he was first elected to this House. It so happened he was assigned as a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, of which I was then the chairman. He served on that committee during the entire time he was in Congress, and when I resigned the chairmanship to accept my present assignment he became chairman and occupied that position at the time of his death.

He was always kind and helpful and was blessed with a personality that made friends for him with everyone he came in contact with. The people of his district, the State of New York, and the Nation have lost a faithful public servant.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep regret that I learned of the death of our colleague from New York, Representative JAMES A. O'LEARY.

During my term as a Member of the House I became rather well acquainted with him. His quiet and unassuming attitude seemed to be a magnet that drew people to him. During his 10 years of service in the House of Representatives he devoted himself wholeheartedly to the best interests of the people of his district. His loss will be deeply felt not only by the people of Staten Island and lower Manhattan, which he represented, but also by all the New York delegation.

To his family I extend my sincere sympathy.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 474) which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. JAMES A. O'LEARY, a Representative from the State of New York.

Resolved, That a committee of six Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following members of the committee: Mr. CELLER, Mr. FISH, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. POWERS, Mr. O'BRIEN of New York, and Mr. BURCHILL of New York.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the remainder of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to; accordingly the House (at 3 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.), pursuant to its order heretofore entered, adjourned until Monday, March 20, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Land Grants Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Friday, March 17, 1944.

Business to be considered: To begin hearings on H. R. 4184, entitled "To amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic."

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will continue its hearings on House Joint Resolution 148 (joint resolution to permit the diversion of waters from Lake Michigan to safeguard the public health) on March 22, 1944, at 10:30 a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1302. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the budget for the War Relocation Authority of the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year 1945 containing an estimate of appropriation amounting to \$40,100,000 (H. Doc. No. 501); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1303. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 14, 1943, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of Intracoastal Waterway throughout Broward County, Fla., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on June 22, 1936, and by an act of Congress approved on June 26, 1936; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1304. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report dated December 10, 1943, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of Waimea, Hanapepe, Wailua, and Hanalei Rivers and their tributaries and Kapaa Swamp on the island of Kauai, T. H.; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1305. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior transmitting pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936; one copy each of various legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 1157. An act to amend section 61 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, for the purpose of providing such training of State and Territorial military forces as is deemed necessary to enable them to execute their internal security responsibilities within their respective States and Territories; without amendment (Rept. No. 1262). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 1250. An act to repeal section 2 of the act approved May 17, 1926, which provides for the forfeiture of pay of persons in the military and naval service of the United States who are absent from duty on account of the direct effects of venereal disease, due to misconduct; without amendment (Rept. No. 1263). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 4420. A bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act by adding a new title thereto relating to the sale or other disposition of surplus property of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 4421. A bill authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ordnance manufacturing and production facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. NORRELL:

H. R. 4422. A bill relating to certain Japanese residents of the United States and to certain citizens of Japanese descent found to be unfriendly to the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 4423. A bill to establish State offices in the Bureau of Mines; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 4424. A bill to amend the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 so as to provide mustering-out payments for certain persons discharged or relieved from active service in the armed forces to accept employment; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

H. R. 4425. A bill to incorporate the Regular Veterans Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. Res. 472. Resolution to create a special committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of race relations in the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By The SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Puerto Rico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to express to Congress of the United States its respectful and firm opposition to have the people of Puerto Rico deprived of its revenue on rum; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take appropriate measures to the end that the doors of Palestine shall be opened for free entry of Jews into that country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 20, 1944

(Legislative day of Monday, February 7, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, we turn to Thee, driven by our drained lives, with tension of the present, anxiety about the future, deep concern about ourselves, our dear ones, our Nation, and our world. As we play our part in days of destiny, with all mankind standing in the valley of decision, we seek the sanctuary of prayer. Entering its gates of peace, we bow for this dedicated moment at a shrine of the spirit, apart from the clamor of the world, from the pull of conflicting opinions, and from the rivalry of personal loyalties. In Thy loving kindness and in Thy tender mercy look upon us; empower us, sustain us, as, toiling feverishly, our strength unequal to our task, we turn again to respond to the call of the world's great need.

In the midst of the dismaying circumstances of our times, open for us the crystal fountain whence the healing waters flow. Towering o'er the wrecks of time, may our eyes behold the conquering sign of a rugged cross and our ears, attuned to the infinite, catch the clear accents of the inevitable Christ, declaring, "I will draw all men unto me." We ask it in His ever-blessed name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, March 16, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—
APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On March 16, 1944:

S. 776. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of Louis H. Pink, superintendent of insurance of the State of New York, or his statutory successor, as statutory liquidator of New York Indemnity Co., against the United States;

S. 1337. An act to extend the time within which the States of Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming may negotiate and enter into a compact or agreement for division of the waters of the Yellowstone River; and

S. 1549. An act for the relief of Vern M. Stanchfield.

On March 17, 1944:

S. 1146. An act to amend section 31 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The VICE PRESIDENT affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1285) to